

4016. 66-35
21

FOUR
C H A R G E S
TO THE
C L E R G Y
OF THE
ARCHDEACONRY OF ESSEX.

I. Some plain arguments to prove, that Christianity does not reject the aid of human learning.

II. An examination of the doctrine of the methodists concerning inward feelings.

III. An examination of the doctrine of the methodists concerning assurances.

IV. An enquiry, whether the article of the resurrection of the body, or flesh, was not inserted into the public creeds before the middle of the fourth century; and whether the language of it is not agreeable to the language of the scriptures: in answer to a posthumous pamphlet of the late Dr. Sykes.

By T. RUTHERFORTH D.D. F.R.S.
Archdeacon of Essex, Kings Professor of Divinity in Cambridge,
And Chaplain to
Her Royal Highness the Princess Dowager of Wales.

CAMBRIDGE,

Printed by J. BENTHAM, Printer to the UNIVERSITY;
For Messrs THURLBOURN and WOODYER in Cambridge;
and sold by J. RICHARDSON and J. BEECROFT in Pater-
Noster-Row, A. MILLAR in the Strand, and C. BATHURST
in Fleet-street, London.

M.DCC.LXIII.

FOUR
C. H. A. R. G. E.
C. L. E. R. G. Y.
THE
ARCHDEACONRY OF ESSSEX.



ERRATA.

Page 11. Note 2; for 14. read 15.

— 33. Note; fifth line from the bottom; for at read of.

CHARGE I.

Some plain arguments to prove, that christianity does not reject the aid of human learning.

REVEREND BRETHREN;

SOON after the reformation, when there was not a sufficient number of learned clergy in our church to supply the several cures in the kingdom; ^a and many congregations must have had no one to administer the sacraments, and to assist them in performing the duty of public prayer; unless such persons, as had little or no learning, were admitted into holy orders; the latter evil was chosen; because it appeared to be the lesser of the two. But this, which was in itself the lesser evil, might have been attended with such consequences, as would have rendered it the greater; if no care had been taken to guard against them. ^b The governours of our church were desirous, that the people should be made acquainted with the scriptures, and should be instructed out of them in the religion of Christ; but they were apprehensive; that, if those unlearned men, whom necessity had ob-

liged

^a Hooker, B. v. § 81.

^b Preface to the Homilies in 1562.

liged them to take into the ministry, were left at liberty to preach and expound, they would at best be useless, and would most commonly be dangerous, guides. They restrained them therefore from attempting to instruct their congregations any otherwise, than by reading the scriptures, and such homilies, as were drawn up by public authority; and they confined the office of preaching and expounding to such of the clergy, as should be found upon examination to be competently learned, and should be licensed for this purpose by the bishop.

Such was the judgment of our church at that time: and its judgment ever since has been the same. Unlearned and ignorant men may, by some accident or other, be now and then obtruded upon it: but its established rules have all along required, that they, who are admitted to preach the gospel, should have qualified themselves for this important office by some competent attainments in literature.

Those new reformers therefore, who are known amongst us by the name of methodists, notwithstanding they sometimes pretend to be genuine sons of the church of England, adopt the language and opinion of the conventicle; when they maintain, "that every believer, provided he has the gift of utterance, is qualified to preach the gospel;"

Canons xlviii. xlix. Stat. 14. Car. 2. c. 19.

^a Mr. B——e's letters printed in *A fragment of the true religion*, p. 16.

nay, * that human learning, instead of being a necessary qualification for a divine, is an impediment, which will keep him from the knowledge of the truth, and instead of assisting him in teaching other men, what they must do to be saved, will stand in the way of his own salvation. Some of them indeed, whatever they may do in private amongst their own people, have not ventured to carry this matter quite so far in their public writings: for they declare, “† that they have no design “to depreciate learning of any kind, and that “they look upon every branch of it as a valuable talent.” They agree however with their brethren,‡ that human learning is of no use at all to a preacher of the gospel: because “in respect of his having divine help for the “work, in which he is engaged, he is like the “apostles; and God, who made them such “workmen, as needed not to be ashamed, “will enable him also rightly to divide the “word of truth.”

This is the substance of what the leaders of the party say to justify their employing in every part of the kingdom a multitude of illiterate preachers, to alienate the regards of the common people from their lawful pastors, to

* Mr. B——e's letters, &c. p. 14, 15, 16.

† Wesley's farther appeal, &c. Par. iii. p. 106.

‡ Ibid. p. 106, 107. — The reader will find the contempt, with which these men treat human learning, set in a very just light in two excellent letters published under the name of Academicus. See p. 5.—9. of the letter to Mr. B——e, and p. 5—11. of the letter to Mr. Whitefield.

the great offence of all sober and intelligent christians, and in opposition to the established discipline and approved practice of our church. And I would bespeak your patience, whilst I examine this defence in as few words, as I can.

When we are enquiring, whether human literature is of any use at present to a preacher of the gospel; the example of the apostles is foreign from the purpose. Their ministry in its nature and circumstances was wholly different from ours. The religion, which they were appointed to teach, was not to be found any where; till they had published it to the world: the writings of the philosophers did not contain it; the prophets under the old testament had only foretold the coming of its divine author and its future publication, but had not published it themselves; and though the truth of all its doctrines, when they and the evidence, which supports them, are laid before us, approves itself to our reason, yet many of them are such, as no deductions of reason could have brought to light. The apostles therefore were in such a situation, that no human art or wisdom could teach them this religion: if they had not learned it from heaven, they could not have learned it at all. But after they had received it from the Holy Spirit of God, and had been fully instructed in it by his influence; they committed it to writing in the sacred books of the new testament: and the proper business of our ministry is; not to call it down
3 from

from heaven again for the instruction of our hearers; but to instruct them in it from these books, which have by the good providence of God been safely transmitted to us. How then can we argue from the ministry of the apostles to our own ministry? Though they in finding out the religion, which they published, when it was not extant any where, neither did nor could receive any assistance from human literature; yet it does not follow, that human literature will be of no use to us in learning the same religion; now it is extant in the sacred writings, and is to be collected by us from thence, before we teach it to others. The prophet Jeremiah was taught by the immediate word of God; ^h that the people of Judah should serve the king of Babylon seventy years, and should then return to their own land: but after this prediction had been committed to writing; Daniel, though he likewise was a prophet, “ⁱ understood by books the “ number of years, whereof the word of the “ Lord came to Jeremiah, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolation of “ Jerusalem.” And in like manner though St. Paul “^k received not the gospel of man, neither was taught it, but by the revelation of “ Jesus Christ;” yet his directions to Timothy are, ^l — “ Hold fast the form of sound words, “ which thou hast heard of me;” ^m and, — “ Give attendance to reading.”

It

^h Jerem. xxv. 11, 12. xxix. 10. ⁱ Dan. ix. 2.

^k Gal. i. 12. ^l 2 Tim. i. 13. ^m 1 Tim. iv. 13.

It may perhaps be doubtful, how far this command about giving attendance to reading extended; whether it related to the sacred books only, or included other books besides these. If we judge of its extent from St. Pauls own writings the latter opinion seems to be the more probable: for his reading was not confined to the scriptures; and though other books were of no use to him in learning the religion of Christ; yet, as occasion offered, he availed himself of them in teaching this religion to mankind. The books, which he left at Troas, were probably not the sacred ones. And to the reasons, ^a which have been given for this opinion by a very able interpreter, we may add, that he was not likely to set a higher value upon any other writings, which he had left at the same place, than upon the scriptures: and yet from the words of his order, — “^o Bring with thee the books, but “especially the parchments,”—we may collect, that he thought the parchments of more value than the books.

Indeed in one of his epistles to the christians at Corinth he tells them, that, “^p when “he came to them, he came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom declaring unto “them the testimony of God; for he determined not to know any thing among them, “save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.” But not.

^a Bull's Sermons, 8vo. p. 400, &c.

^o 2 Tim. iv. 13. ^p 1 Cor. ii. 1, 2,

notwithstanding this, we find *him quoting one of the Greek poets in his discourse to the people of Athens, another in his epistle to Titus, and a third in this very epistle to the church of Corinth: so that his laying aside all the knowledge, which he had acquired in the course of a learned education, when he first preached the gospel to the people of this city, was not owing to any persuasion, that human literature can never be applied to any good purpose in teaching christianity, and much less that to be a scholar is inconsistent with the character of a christian divine, but to something in their situation and temper, which made such a conduct the most proper for him to hold upon that particular occasion. Certainly if Titus, "whom he left in Crete to "ordain elders in every city, and to set in "order the things, which were wanting," had given it in charge to those, who were ordained by him, that they should look upon learning as an impediment, which would keep them from the truth, or even as an useless qualification in preaching the gospel; he could not have justified himself by the example of St. Paul, who in giving him directions for his be-

haviour

to know, that the bible was not written in

Acts xvii. 28. Τὸ γὰρ καὶ γινώσκουσιν ἱσμεν.

Arar.

Tit. i. 12. Κότες αὖτις ψευδοί, κατὰ ἑαυτοὺς ἰσχυροὶ ἀλογοί.

Epimenid.

1 Cor. xv. 23. Ὁ θεὸς ἡμεῖς ἀποθανόντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀποθανόντες.

Merand.

Tit. i. 5.

* See above at p. 2.

haviour in the important office, to which he was appointed, alledged the testimony of Epimenides to prove, that *the Cretans were always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.*

But though we should grant, what does not seem probable, that St. Paul, however extensive his own reading might be, intended only to require, that Timothy should be diligent in reading the holy scriptures; yet it should be observed, that, when he required this, almost all the books of the new testament had been written, and were included in the notion of scripture, as might easily be proved, if it was necessary. The command, when thus restrained, if it is compared with what St. Paul says of himself, that he was not taught christianity any otherwise than by immediate revelation, will be sufficient to point out the proper distinction between the ministry of the apostles and the ministry of all future preachers of the gospel: and this is the only use, which I have hitherto made of it.

But this command, even upon the foregoing supposition, which restrains its meaning to the reading of the scriptures, will carry us one step farther. There are, I believe, many of these new guides, who are so ignorant as not to know, that the bible was not written in their mother-tongue. It would be to no purpose to ask such men as these; whether they should have been able to read the books, in which the doctrines and precepts of the gospel are contained; if they had never been

trans-

* See above at p. 5.

translated into English? But what answer will the leaders of the party make to this question? If they answer in the affirmative; let them produce any one of their unlettered preachers; and we may make an easy experiment by giving him either the old or the new testament in the original language, and desiring him to read two or three words, and to tell us the meaning of them. If they hesitate, when we ask this question, and give such evasive answers, as imply, what they sometimes intimate, but dare not avow, that the help, which these illiterate men receive from God, is such as will enable them to preach Christs gospel without reading the scriptures; St. Pauls command to Timothy is a sufficient confutation of this groundless or rather impious pretence: for if Timothy, who was one of the immediate successors of the apostles in the office of preaching the gospel, was required to give attendance to the reading of the scriptures, that he might learn the doctrines and precepts of christianity from thence; we may be sure, that this is the way, in which all others, who undertake the same office, ought to learn them.

Perhaps they may be ready to reply, that though christianity, now it is contained in the books of the new testament, ought to be learned by reading these books; yet it may be

* Wesleys farther appeal, &c. Par. iii. p. 106, 107.
Dealings of God with Mr. George Whitefield. pag. 25.
Journal on board the Elizabeth. pag. 32.

be learned without reading them in the original; and that all those, whom we call unlettered and ignorant men, are able to read them in a translation. But not to mention, that the truth of this fact is very questionable, the answer itself is nothing to the present purpose. For when I ask, whether such illiterate men, as they have thought fit to employ in the ministry of preaching, would have been able to read the new testament, if it had never been translated into English; I only want to shew them, that the circumstances of our religion are such, as have made literature necessary for preserving the knowledge of it, and much more for spreading this knowledge amongst mankind; and it is plain, that however able these new teachers may be to read the new testament in a translation; yet as the original could not at this time have been read by any one, so neither could a translation have been made for them to read it in, without the help of human learning.

When we thus find, that the same means must be made use of in reading the scriptures, as in reading any other book, which was written in any of the learned languages; that we must have learning of our own, if we read them in the original, and must be obliged to the learning of other men, if we read them in a translation; we may reasonably conclude, that the same means are necessary for the right understanding of the scriptures, as for the right understanding of any other book, which was written in antient times and in a distant country; that we must have learning of our

own to enable us to interpret them for ourselves, and, if we have not learning enough to qualify us for this work, must have recourse to the assistance of those, who have.

St. Peter has authorized me to say, " that " there are in the scriptures some things hard " to be understood." And can any one imagine, that those things, which in his judgment were hard to be understood, are such as every unlettered mechanic, who leaves the work of his craft, in which alone he has hitherto been occupied, and calls himself a preacher of the gospel, is able to explain? Is not it much more likely, that they are the safest guides and most profitable instructors, who from their childhood have known the holy scriptures, and have diligently and faithfully made use of all the helps to understand them, which the providence of God by means of a liberal education has put into their hands; * who " have given attendance to reading, have meditated on these things, and have given " themselves wholly to them?"

Nor let any one suppose, that what the apostle here speaks of are only matters of curious speculation, about which both the preachers of the gospel and their hearers may safely make what judgment they please: for he expressly tells us, that they are such, as " the " unlearned and unstable wrest to their own " destruction." St. Peters epistles were more im-

* 2 Pet. iii. 16.

* 1 Tim. iv. 13, 14.

immediately addressed to such christians, ^v as had been jews of the dispersion: and these by means of the Greek version of the old testament, which was in constant use amongst them, commonly learned from their infancy the language, in which the new testament is written; so that they were not only able to read this language, but were also well acquainted with the precise meaning of the words and with the several idioms of it. They had likewise been brought up in an habitual knowledge of the customs and opinions of their brethren, to which the sacred writers frequently allude: and the times, in which they lived, gave them a clear and distinct view of the errors and misconceits, which these writers oppose and endeavour to correct: but notwithstanding the helps, which their situation gave them in these and many other instances; we find, that they had occasion for some farther skill and abilities, which they might acquire by reading and meditation; and that they, who wanted these qualifications, that is, they, whom the apostle calls *unlearned*, perverted the scriptures, when they pretended to interpret them. How dangerous therefore must it be for any one in our times to trust himself in the hands of ignorant and illiterate teachers; when, besides such a degree of learning as was necessary to enable those, who lived in the times of the apostles, to understand the scriptures, we cannot without much pains and

and study acquire that knowledge, which their particular situation made obvious to them ?

Far be it from me to say or to think, that we receive no help from the Holy Spirit in discharging the work of the ministry. But there is not the least evidence, that whoever takes upon himself to preach the gospel, now it is to be collected from the sacred writings, has the same miraculous assistances, which were given to the apostles, when they were called to preach it, before it was any where extant. And as to the ordinary influences of the Holy Ghost ; they only work together with us : they do not, either in the work of our own salvation, or in the work of instructing others, make our own endeavours unnecessary.

Those persons however may be true believers, who, for want of having had leisure to store their minds with useful literature, are not qualified to be pastors and teachers : though they are too unlearned to be able to explain those things in the scriptures, which are hard to be understood ; yet unless they are *unstable* as well as unlearned, they will not wrest them to their own destruction. The wisdom of the public has provided such guides for them, as are both able and willing to shew them the good and the right way : and it is their duty * to “ continue in the “ things, which they have learned” from these guides,

* 2 Tim. iii. 14. Tit. i. 9.

guides, and to "hold fast the faithful word
 "as they have been taught." They are then
 only in danger of being misled; when forsak-
 ing their lawful pastors "they heap to them-
 selves teachers, and are carried about with
 every wind of doctrine."

* 2 Tim. iv. 3. Ephes. iv. 14.

It is to be collected from the sacred writings,
 that the same miraculous assistances, which
 were given to the apostles, when they were
 called to preach, before it was any where
 extended. And as to the ordinary influences of
 the Holy Ghost; they only work together with
 us: they do not, either in the work of our
 own salvation, or in the work of instructing
 others, make our own endeavours unne-
 cessary.

Those persons however, may be true be-
 lievers, who, for want of having had leisure to
 store their minds with useful literature, are
 not qualified to be pastors and teachers:
 though they are too unlearned to be able to
 explain those things in the scriptures, which
 are hard to be understood; yet, as they are
 well as unlearned, they will not

CHARGE

wrest them to their own destruction. The
 wisdom of the apostle has provided such
 guides for them, as are both able and willing
 to show them the good and the right way:
 and it is their duty "to continue in the
 things which they have learned from these
 guides."

CHARGE II.

*An examination of the doctrine of the
methodists concerning inward feelings.*

REVEREND BRETHREN;

THOUGH it may be very difficult, and in many instances impracticable, to bring those men back to a sober mind and a right understanding, who, mistaking their own groundless fancies for clear and evident perceptions, have persuaded themselves, that they have an inward sense or feeling of the Holy Spirit of God; yet for our own information and for the instruction of such, as are not yet given up to this delusion; it may be worth the while to enquire, whether we have any reason to believe, that the mind has any inward feeling, which will enable it to perceive the ordinary influences of this Spirit, so as to discern from whence they come.

The mind has indeed a sort of feeling distinct from the senses of the body, by which, if it attends to what passes within itself, it can discern the faculties and affections, which actually exist in it, and can compare those, which it has now, with those, which it had

at

at some other time. But it is one thing, to perceive them, when they are there, and to know what alterations have been made in them; it is another thing, to perceive the causes, which generate or improve; which debase or destroy them. We perceive the faculties and affections, which we have in our minds, and we discern the changes, which they have undergone, by an inward consciousness, or, if any one likes the expression better, by an inward feeling of the mind: but the causes, upon which they depend, and the operations of these causes are perceived only by means of the senses of the body.

When I speak of the *senses of the body*, I would not be understood to mean, that our material bodies have any powers of sensation, which are properly their own, and are not derived to them from their union with an immaterial soul or mind. I make use of these words to denote those organs of the body, which convey to the mind the sensations of hearing, feeling, seeing, tasting, and smelling.

And

^a Athenis tenue cœlum, ex quo etiam acutiores putantur Attici: crassum Thebis, itaque pingues Thebani et valentes. Cic. de fato. §. 4.

^b Campani semper superbi bonitate agrorum, et fructuum magnitudine, urbis salubritate, descriptione, pulchritudine. 1 Orat. de leg. agrar. ad populum. §. 35.

Mr. Wesley says, that "by the most infallible of all proofs, *inward feeling*, he was convinced of being "proud." *Journal from his embarking for Georgia to his return to London.* pag. 64. It is rather too much

to

And what I mean to affirm is ; that, whilst the soul is united to such a body, as we have at present, the operations of external things upon it, if they make no sensible impressi^on upon some one or more of these organs, excite no inward feeling : we get our knowledge of these operations, when we have any, not by immediate and simple perception, but by reasoning upon such observations, as give us only a remote and indirect notice of them.

^a The national dullness of the Thebans, and the bright genius and quick parts of the Athenians were commonly ascribed to the soil and the air of their respective countries. But whatever effect the soil or the air of a country may have upon the understanding of its inhabitants ; yet, as their operation does not fall under the notice of the bodily senses, neither the Thebans nor the Athenians could discern, whether the turn and complexion of their minds was innate, or whether it was derived from these external causes. Cicero remarks ^b, “ that the Campanians were rendered “ haugh-

to allow, that his inward perceptions are *infallible* ; but we readily grant, that they did not deceive him in this instance, and that he, like the Campanians, if he reflected upon what passed within his own mind, might perceive, that he was proud. In the mean time we deny, that he had any inward feeling or perception of the cause, which produced this pride, or of the operation, by which it was produced ; that he had any inward sense or touch, by which he could distinguish, whether it arose from the operations of Satan, or was the work of his own heart.

“ haughty and arrogant by the healthiness
 “ and beauty of Capua, by the fertility of
 “ the land about it, and by the plenty and
 “ abundance, in which they lived.” They
 might undoubtedly see and feel the advantage
 of their situation with their outward senses;
 and each of them might perceive his own
 haughtiness and arrogance by an inward sense;
 but they could not discern by any seeing or
 feeling of the mind, that one of these was
 produced by the other; because this was done
 without raising any distinct sensation in the
 organs of the body. The splenetic and change-
 ful temper of the English, their impatience
 of control, their gloominess and anxiety under
 fancied evils, and their sudden despondency,
 when they meet with the slightest misfor-
 tunes, are thought to be owing to a sort of
 infection, which is derived from their usual
 diet, from the temperature of their atmo-
 sphere, and from the nature of their climate.
 The dispositions, which are generated by this
 infection, cannot be in the mind without be-
 ing felt by it: but as the infection itself and
 its operations upon the mind are not per-
 ceived by our outward senses, so none of us,
 I presume, have ever discerned them by any
 inward feeling.

Naturalists indeed are not universally agreed
 about the truth of the opinion, which I have
 here followed. But if there are many, who
 maintain, that the temper or disposition of
 the people in any country does not depend
 upon the climate, soil, winds, and food; there
 are

are likewise many, who maintain on the contrary, that it does: and without determining, which of the two parties is in the right; the very existence of this controversy, and the manner, in which it is managed, are sufficient for my purpose. For in the first place, there never could have been any such controversy; if the mind, by means of an inward sense, had as clear and full a perception of all impressions, which external causes make upon it, as it has of light by means of the eye, or of sound by means of the ear; and could as certainly distinguish, by its own immediate touch, between affections, which are raised in it by these impressions, and affections, which arise in it spontaneously, as it can by the help of the bodily organs between the tastes of different fruits, and the smells of different flowers. And secondly, all naturalists, of whichever party they are, plainly shew by their management of this controversy, that they know of no such feeling either in themselves, or in other men: for they never appeal to it on either side, but endeavour to support their respective opinion only by reason and argument.

Madness is the most violent of all the agitations of the mind: and this arises from some bodily disorder; for the cure of it, when it can be cured at all, is effected by medicines, which the physician applies to the body, and not by religion, which is the medicine of the soul. But in the first attack of this disorder the mind does not usually per-

ceive by any inward feeling, that the shock, by which its reasoning powers are overset, comes from without: and yet the health or distempers, the soundness or disorders of the body are properly external and adventitious causes in respect of the motions, affections, or dispositions, which they occasion in the mind. No great stress perhaps ought to be laid upon what a lunatic does, or does not, perceive, whilst his fits are upon him, or even in the first attack of them. But when his disorder remits and gives him a lucid interval; does his mind then discover by any feeling of its own, that this is the effect of a right disposition in his body? It may feel indeed, that it is then calm and composed: but has it any inward feeling or perception of the cause, to which its calmness and composure are owing? If the disease is cured by medicines, it may then know, that its sanity is owing to adventitious causes, and not to its own efforts: but it has its information from the sight or the taste, or some other of the senses of the body, which were affected by the medicines, and not from its own feeling.

These observations, whilst they help to guard us against the delusions of those strolling preachers, who confine the influence of Gods Holy Spirit to themselves and their followers, will furnish us likewise with an answer to those speculative men, who would persuade us to disbelieve all the promises, which Christ has made to mankind, of assisting them by this Spirit in the work of their
salva-

salvation. For when the latter conclude, that no one is assisted by the Holy Ghost, because no one feels its workings; and the former, that its influence is confined to their own fraternity, because these workings are felt by no one else; they both argue from this common principle, that the mind has an inward feeling of its own, by which, without the help of the senses of the body, it not only perceives all the affections and dispositions, which are produced in it by external or adventitious causes, but likewise discerns the causes themselves, and can distinguish between such affections and dispositions, as are so produced, and such others, as are natural to it, or are produced by its own efforts.

If then either the infidel or the methodist should ask us, upon what evidence we believe, that we have any assistance afforded us in the work of our salvation by the influence of Gods Holy Spirit? We may answer, that we believe it upon the authority of Christ, who by himself and by his apostles has promised us this assistance: and if his authority is not opposed by any positive evidence of sense; the negative evidence of our not perceiving this Spirit, and not discerning the divinity of its influence by an inward touch of the mind, ought to have no weight with us. For we have no reason to think, that the Holy Ghost cannot enlighten, and purify, and strengthen our minds, without making itself and its influence, what neither of them are in their own nature, the objects of our bodily senses: and we find,
by

by observing what happens in other instances, that the mind in its present situation has no inward sense of its own, by which the influence of external causes, or the causes themselves, may be felt or discerned; and that it then only perceives them, when they affect the organs of the body, so as to raise a sensation in it by their means.

Should the methodist reply, that, when he plainly and distinctly feels the work of God in his soul, no reasoning in the world can persuade him out of his senses, and convince him, that he does not feel it; we may desire him to recollect, that in the controversy between him and us there are properly two questions: one is; whether the operations of the Holy Ghost are of such a sort, and are communicated in such a manner, that no man can be assisted by them without feeling them? the other is; whether, in what he supposes himself to feel, he does not mistake the groundless fancies of his imagination for clear and distinct perceptions? In the former question this reply is nothing to the purpose: for whatever his feelings may be; if we, who have none of them, may notwithstanding this be under the influence of divine grace, as well as he; we have no occasion to go to his school to learn christianity. In the latter question, as I hinted at first, we have no great hopes of convincing him by reason and argument, that his supposed feelings are not to be depended on: for it is, we know, a fundamental principle in his school, that all, who
come

come into it, must renounce their reason, and submit themselves without reserve to the dictates of the infallible guides, who preside there. We may however advise him to consider; whether, instead of our persuading him out of his senses, it is not possible, that they, after having persuaded him out of his reason, may have led him to imagine, that he has such an inward sense in this instance, as nature has not given him in any other.

And yet such is the force of truth, that even these guides, notwithstanding what they usually inculcate concerning the evidence of inward feelings, are sometimes constrained to own, that all their experiences may possibly be delusions. One of them, he best knows how consistently with his standing doctrine of convictions and assurances, cautions his followers “ against judging of the spirit, by “ which any one speaks, by their own inward “ feelings, or by revelations supposed to be “ made to their souls; because these being all “ of a doubtful nature may come from God, “ or may not.” What therefore shall we think of these inward feelings? They may be clear and distinct perceptions of such affections, inclinations, or sentiments, as are in the mind: but if it is doubtful even to those, who have them, whether they come from God or not; they cannot be clear and distinct perceptions of the cause, from which these affections, inclinations, or sentiments are derived.

* Wellesys journal from Aug. 12. 1738. to Nov. 1. 1739. pag. 60, 61.

rived. They may be feelings of some internal motions or persuasions; but if they leave men in uncertainty, whether these motions and persuasions are the work of the Holy Ghost, or the groundless fancies of their own imagination, or the suggestions of Satan; they cannot be feelings of the Holy Ghost itself, or of its divine operations. Another of these guides confesses upon a review of his past conduct; ^a "that wild-fire has been mixed
 "with his zeal; and that he finds himself to
 "have frequently written and spoken too
 "much in his own spirit, when he thought
 "himself to have been writing and speaking
 "by the Spirit of God." From hence we may understand, what was formerly the nature of his inward feelings; and we have no reason to believe, that it is not the same now. As far as they extended, he might be as certain of what he felt within him, as he can be of any thing by the evidence of his outward senses: what we doubt about is the point, in which he confesses himself to have been often mistaken, and consequently in which he had no such evidence. He might plainly and distinctly perceive the motions and sentiments of his mind: but if he had plainly and distinctly perceived the cause, by which they were excited, he could not have thought, that he was delivering the dictates of the Holy Spirit, when he was only delivering the dictates of his own.

God

^a Mr. Whitefields letter on board the brigg Betsey, in his remarks on the comparison of methodists and papists, pag. 35.

God can indeed, if he pleases, communicate the influence of the Holy Ghost to the minds of men in a different manner from the influence of other external and adventitious causes : and we learn from the scriptures, that it has sometimes been communicated to them in such a manner, as to be clearly and certainly known by them. When * Paul was pressed *in spirit*, or rather, as it is in the margin of our English bibles, when he was pressed *by the spirit*, to testify to the Jews at Corinth, that Jesus is Christ; when the spirit suffered him not to go into Bithynia, and forbad him to preach the word in Asia; when it commanded Peter to go to Cornelius, and Philip to go near and join himself to the Æthiopians chariot; they could undoubtedly distinguish its directions and impulses from the motions and inclinations of their own mind. Whether the leaders of the methodists have the same distinct communications or not, we may judge † from their mistaking the dictates of their own spirit for the dictates of the Holy Ghost, from their uncertainty, whether their inward feelings come from God or from some other cause, and likewise from their confessing, as they sometimes do, ‡ “ that, “ when

* Acts xviii. 5. xvi. 7. 6. x. 19. viii. 29.

† See above at pag. 24.

‡ Wesley's journal from his embarking for Georgia to his return to London. pag. 63, 64.

Mr. Wesley sometimes endeavours to explain away the doctrine of the methodists concerning in-

D

ward

“ when they find themselves utterly unwilling
 “ to speak, they are perplexed with doubts,
 “ whether this is a prohibition from the good
 “ Spirit, or a temptation from nature and the
 “ evil one.”

How-

ward feelings. “ By feeling, says he, I mean being
 “ inwardly conscious of; by the operations of the
 “ Spirit I do not mean the manner, in which he ope-
 “ rates, but the graces, which he operates in a chri-
 “ stian.” See his *Farther appeal*, &c. P. i. pag. 38.
 And agreeably to this explanation he writes thus in
 his letter to Mr. Downes, pag. 14. “ We believe, that
 “ love, joy, peace are inwardly felt, or they have no
 “ being; and that men are satisfied they have grace
 “ first by feeling these, and afterward by their out-
 “ ward actions.” But if he and his brethren, when
 they talk of inward feelings, mean only; that men
 perceive within themselves, or are inwardly conscious
 of, certain good affections, which influence their ac-
 tions; and that from what the scriptures have inform-
 ed them concerning the present condition of human
 nature, and concerning the promises of God, they
 have reason to believe, that the Holy Ghost has assisted
 their endeavours to acquire, improve, or confirm these
 good affections; if this, I say, be their meaning, why
 do they speak of this matter in such language, as mis-
 leads their disciples, and makes them expect, and pre-
 tend to have, an inward sense, by which they feel some-
 times the power of God, sometimes the Holy Ghost,
 sometimes Jesus Christ, and by which they can as
 clearly discern each of these, whilst he acts upon
 them, as they can outward objects by their bodily
 senses. Mr. Wesley has certainly countenanced some
 of the wildest fancies about *feelings*, that ever entered
 into the heads of ignorant enthusiasts. “ When he
 “ examined some of his disciples touching their ex-
 “ periences,

However; our present enquiry is not concerning the instinct or inspiration, by which the apostles and their companions were guided in discharging the extraordinary office, to which they were called; but concerning the ordinary

“periences, and they related their feeling the blood
 “of Christ running upon their arms, or going down
 “their throat, or poured like warm water upon their
 “breast and heart;” Did he tell them, that these
 circumstances were *all* the mere empty dreams of
 an heated imagination? No: he only said, “that
 “*many* of them were so; but at the same time he
 “allowed (though this, he said, was the utmost he
 “could allow, without renouncing both scripture and
 “reason) that *some* of them might be from God,
 “working in an unusual manner.” See his journal
 from Sept. 3. 1741. to Oct. 27. 1743. p. 70.

When he testifies, in the same journal, pag. 71.
 that “Lucy Godshall felt the love of God *in an un-
 “usual manner* poured into her heart;” he would do
 well to reconcile this with his declaring as above,
 that according to the doctrine of the methodists, what
 they feel are only the good affections, which the Holy
 Ghost produces in them, and *not the manner*, in which
 he works.

In the same paragraph of his letter to Mr. Downes,
 which I have quoted just now, where he declares his
 belief, that men may feel, that is, may perceive, such
 good affections, as the grace of God produces in their
 minds; he carries this matter farther, and says, “We
 “do speak of grace (meaning thereby the power of
 “God, which worketh in us both to will and to do
 “of his good pleasure) that it is as perceptible to the
 “heart (while it comforts, refreshes, purifies, and
 “sheds the love of God abroad therein) as sensible
 “objects are to the senses.” If words have any mean-

ordinary influences of divine grace, by which the heart of each particular christian is purified, his faith assisted, and his virtue supported. The effects of our regeneration, which are called by St. Paul ^b “ the fruits of the Spirit, are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.” These affections cannot be in the mind without being perceived by it; if it reflects upon and examines into its own temper and disposition. But Christ has taught us, that the work of our regeneration is carried on too secretly for the mind to discern the cause of it. ⁱ “ The wind,” says he, in his conversation with Nicodemus, “ bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth; so is every one, who is born of the Spirit.” The terms of this comparison are two persons; one, who is born of

ing, he here declares, not that the comfort, which God administers, but that the power of God itself, whilst it administers comfort, may be felt, and that the very act of Gods working may be clearly discerned.

Mr. Whitefield “ felt Gods power with him — felt “ Gods power come upon him — experienced fresh “ teachings and communications from Gods Holy “ Spirit — felt the Holy Ghost come upon him — “ assuredly felt and knew it was Jesus Christ, that revealed himself unto his soul — does not know, that “ they use the word *sensible*, when they talk of the operations of the Spirit of God; but if they do, they “ do not mean, that Gods Spirit manifests itself to “ their *senses*, but that it may be perceived by the “ *soul*,

of the Spirit, or whose mind is renewed by the influence of the Holy Ghost; and another, who hears the sound, that is, who perceives the effect of the wind, but does not know the cause of it. Every one, who is born of the Spirit, is like you, when you hear the sound of the wind, but cannot discern, whence it cometh or whither it goeth. There will be no resemblance between these two persons, and no foundation for this comparison; if, whilst one of them perceives, by his outward sense, only the effect of the wind, without perceiving its cause, the other, by his inward sense, has a distinct perception not only of those good affections, which are the effect of his regeneration, but likewise of the Holy Ghost, by which it is wrought. Since therefore Christ has taught us, that the Spirit of God enters into our souls, and renews them by its influence, without being perceived by us; what reason can we have to believe, that, whilst

“*soul*, as really, as is any sensible impression made “upon their body.” See his journal on board the Elizabeth, p. 21, 22. 72. His 7th journal, edit. 2. p. 72. Gods dealings with him from his infancy, &c. &c. p. 32. And his letter to the bishop of Gloucester; in his journal, whilst detained in England by the embargo, p. 19.

Such is the doctrine of the leaders of the methodists, when they speak from the press: and what sort of inward feelings their unlettered and ignorant emissaries insist upon, is matter of notoriety in almost every town and village in the kingdom.

^h Gal. v. 22.

ⁱ Joh. iii. 8.

whilst it dwells there, and assists us in completing the work of our salvation, it will give us any sensible experiences or inward feelings of its presence?

One of the leaders of this new sect says indeed, ^k "that it is in the spiritual life, as "in the natural, some feel more, others less, "but all experience some pangs and travel, "e'er Christ is formed in them:" another of them gives the following account from one of his correspondents; ^l "as my mother bore me "with great pain, so did I feel great pain "in being born of God." And both agree; "m that some of their hearers are constrained "to roar aloud, while the sword of the Spirit "is dividing asunder their soul and spirit, and "joints and marrow; that many tremble exceedingly,

^k Whitefields journal 3. p. 82.

^l See Wesleys journal from Aug. 12. 1737 -- 8, &c. pag. 18.

^m Wesleys journal from Aug. 12. 1738. to Nov. 1. 1739. p. 62. and from Sept. 3. 1741. to Oct. 27. 1743. p. 77, 78. Whitefields journal 7. p. 59.

ⁿ Whitefields journal 6. p. 38.

Mr. Wesley sometimes denies, that the methodists ever consider these fits as signs of the new birth. To this question; "What are the signs, that the new birth *is wrought*? He answers, we never said or thought, "that they were either frightful tremors of body, or "agonies of mind, attended with bodily convulsions. "Although we know many persons, who, *before* this "change was wrought, felt much fear and sorrow of "heart, which in some of these had such an effect on "the body, as to make all their bones to shake." See his letter to Mr. Downes, pag. 15. In some of his writings

“ceedingly, and drop down as dead; that
 “there are shriekings in every corner of their
 “congregations; that some are struck down
 “and become exceeding weak in body, so as
 “to be scarce able to move, whilst God is
 “working powerfully in their souls.” Are
 these then the fruits of the Spirit? Are these
 the marks, by which we may be assured, that
 their disciples, when they are thus affected,
 discern its divine workings by an inward
 feeling? No one can possibly believe this;
 when even they, after all their own experiences,
 are so far from believing it themselves, that
 they sometimes attribute these shriekings,
 faintings, and fallings to the workings of
 Satan. For one of them ““ having observed
 “ five persons in agonies so strong, as if affect-
 “ ed

writings he calls these fallings and roarings and other
 disorders by the name of *convictions*. “Monday
 “ [July] 23. On several evenings this week, and par-
 “ ticularly on Friday, many were deeply convinced;
 “ but none were delivered from that painful convic-
 “ tion; *the children came to the birth, but there was*
 “ *not strength to bring forth.*” What these convictions
 were, is explained in what follows. “Monday 30.
 “ Two more in strong pain, both their souls and bo-
 “ dies being well-nigh torn asunder. But though we
 “ cried unto God, there was no answer; neither did
 “ he as yet deliver them at all.” See his journal from
 Aug. 12. 1738. to Nov. 1. 1739. pag. 68. Whether
 Mr. Wesley, or any of the leaders of the methodists,
 have ever said, that what he here calls *convictions* are
 signs, that the new birth *is wrought*; I know not;
 but he certainly speaks of them as outward signs,
 that the new birth *is working* by the power of God in
 those,

“ ed by fits, declares, that in his opinion some
 “ such agonies are from the devil : ” and the
 other, “ after enquiring particularly into the
 “ case of those, who during his preaching
 “ cried aloud, were seized with violent pain,
 “ lost all their strength, and dropped to the
 “ ground ; says, that he can no more impute
 “ these

those, who have them: however it may sometimes
 happen that, as we have just now found him expres-
 sing himself, the children come to the birth, but there
 is not strength to bring forth. Speaking of those, who
 suffered bodily disorders in his congregation, he says;
 “ I had an opportunity to talk with Mr. Whitefield
 “ of those outward signs, which had so often accom-
 “ panied the inward work of God.” See the same
 journal pag. 65. One of his disciples in a letter, which
 he has published with marks of approbation, writes
 thus ; “ I found the work of the spirit very powerful
 “ upon me, although you know God does not deal
 “ with every soul in the same way. As my mother
 “ bore me with pain, so did I feel great pain in my
 “ soul in being born of God. Indeed I thought the
 “ pains of death were upon me, and that my soul
 “ was then taking leave of my body. In this violent
 “ agony I continued about four hours, and then I be-
 “ gan to feel the Spirit of God bearing witness with
 “ my spirit, that I was born of God.” See the same
 journal pag. 18. “ While I was declaring, that Jesus
 “ Christ had given himself a ransom for all; three per-
 “ sons, almost at once, sunk down as dead, having
 “ all their sins set in array against them : but in a short
 “ time they were raised up, and knew, that the lamb
 “ of God, who taketh away the sin of the world, had
 “ taken away their sins.” Ibid. pag. 46. In the same
 journal the reader will find many instances, in which
 he expresses himself in the same manner. And if
 there

“ these symptoms to any natural cause, than
 “ to the Spirit of God ; ° and makes no doubt,
 “ but it was Satan tearing them, as they were
 “ coming to Christ.” What experienced physicians of the soul these must be, who are so unable to distinguish the influence of the Holy Ghost from the tearing of Satan, as to ascribe the same symptoms in their patients sometimes to one and sometimes to the other!

What

there can still be any doubt, whether he considers these fits as outward signs, that the new birth is working by the power of God in those, who have them; the following account, which he writes to one of his correspondents, will make the matter clear. “ I
 “ have seen very many persons changed in a moment
 “ from the spirit of fear, horror, despair to the Spirit
 “ of love, joy, peace; and from sinful desire, till then
 “ reigning over them, to a pure desire of doing the
 “ will of God. — That such a change was then
 “ wrought, appears (not from their shedding tears
 “ *only*, or falling into fits, or crying out; these are
 “ not the fruits whereby I judge, but) from the whole
 “ tenor of their lives.” But though he thus denies these tears and fits and shrieks to be the *fruits* by which he judges, that this inward change *is wrought*; yet he goes on to shew that he looks upon them as *outward signs*, that it *is working*. “ Perhaps, says he,
 “ it might be because of the hardness of our hearts,
 “ unready to receive any thing unless we see it with
 “ our eyes, and hear it with our ears, that God in
 “ tender condescension to our weakness, suffered so
 “ many outward signs at the very time, when he
 “ wrought this inward change, to be continually seen
 “ and heard among us.” Ibid. pag. 49, 50.

° Wesley's journal from Sept. 3. 1741. to Oct. 27. 1743. p. 91.

What clear and distinct perceptions their patients must have, who cannot inform them, whether their minds are surrounded with light or with darkness, whether what they feel is the work of God, or the work of the devil!

But let us turn once more to the scriptures; and let them shew from thence, that all, or that most, or that any of those, who in the times of the apostles were born of the Spirit, and received the faith of Christ, were thrown into these or the like agonies by the inward feeling of a divine influence. Here perhaps we shall be told of Paul, who at his conversion "fell to the earth, and cried out with "trembling and astonishment, Lord, what "wilt thou have me to do!"^a and of the jailor, who "fell down trembling at the feet "of Paul and Silas, saying, Sirs, what must I "do to be saved!" But to what purpose are these examples produced? Pauls astonishment, which made him fall to the earth, was occasioned not by any clear and distinct perception of the operation of the Spirit within him, but by an external light from heaven: nor was it any secret whisper, which made him cry out, but the voice of Christ speaking to his outward ears, and saying, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And as far as appears from the sacred history, the jailors emotions were owing to what came under the notice of his bodily senses, and not to any inward feel-

^a Acts ix. 3, &c. Hartleys sermons, p. 153, 154.

^a Acts xvi. 25, &c. Wesleys journal from Aug. 12. 1738. to Nov. 1. 1739. p. 63. Hartley as above.

feeling of a divine influence. He was awakened from sleep by "an earthquake: and when " he found the prison-doors open, he drew his " sword, and would have killed himself, sup- " posing, that the prisoners were fled. But " when Paul had called to him, saying, do " thyself no harm, for we are all here;" he recollected, for what reason the magistrates had committed him and his companion to prison; and rightly concluding, that the earthquake and the opening of the doors were the work of God, who gave this testimony to the truth of the religion, which they taught, he was struck by this miracle with a reverential fear, and begged of them to instruct him in the way of salvation.

It is as little to the purpose to alledge, * that those three thousand persons, who were added to the church by St. Peters sermon on the day of pentecost, " were pricked in the heart, " when they heard it, and cryed out; Men " and brethren, what shall we do!" The miraculous gift of languages, which the apostles received on that day, and of which they had given manifest proofs in the presence of these persons, was certainly of great weight in bringing about their conversion: and the promises of the gospel will shew us, that neither they, nor any one else, ever entered upon the christian life, without the inward assistance of divine grace. Whether they were, or were not, thus assisted, is not the question at present;

* Acts ii. 41. Wesley's journal, and Hartley as above.

sent; but whether it was an inward feeling and discernment of the Holy Ghost working their conversion, which made them so cry out. I readily allow the truth of what the sacred historian has written, that they were pricked, that is, had a quick and lively sense of sorrow, in their heart. But he has neither written nor intimated, that they perceived this to be the work of the Holy Ghost by any inward feeling. For can no one be pricked in the heart, without having a clear and distinct perception, that this is done by the sword of the Spirit? Do not we read, that the jews, upon hearing what Stephen had said before the council, were not only pricked, 'but even *cut to the heart*; and that they had likewise some of the outward symptoms of these supposed pangs of the new birth; for *they cried with loud voices, and gnashed with their teeth*? I see a wide difference indeed between these two cases: they, who stoned Stephen, were excited to commit a great wickedness; they, who were converted by Peter, were excited to repent of their sins, and to embrace the gospel. But this is a difference, which the men, with whom we are now contending, can make no use of: unless they will own, that the influence of Gods holy Spirit, and the suggestions of a wicked heart, are not to be distinguished from one another by inward feelings, but by comparing them with the law of nature, and the written word of God; and that the work of the spirit does not consist in groanings and shriek-

shriekings, in gnashings and foamings, in losing all strength of body, and all the reasoning powers of the mind, but in repentance from dead works and belief of the gospel.

It would be unreasonable, if any one should require me after all either to explain the true causes of those emotions, which are said to be frequent in the congregations of these new teachers, or else to allow, that they are raised by an inward feeling of the work of God in the soul: for it is very possible, that we may know certainly, what is not the cause of them, though we are not able to find out, what is. We know however, that notwithstanding they are ready with a presumption, which may well be called blasphemous, to administer unhallowed comfort to such of their votaries, as have wholly given themselves up into their power; yet they seldom fail in their preachings to decree inevitable damnation, and to thunder out the most dreadful curses against those, whom they are pleased to call the unconvicted or unregenerate part of their hearers. It is no wonder therefore if persons, who have either a weak understanding, or a weak habit of body, should sometimes be so terrified by them as to fall into fits, or even to be quite deprived of their senses: for these are no unusual effects, where men are affrighted beyond what they are able to bear.

Perhaps, if the reasonable and christian temper of our laws, had not restrained the civil magistrate from interposing his authority;
these

these disorders might in many instances have been found to be impious frauds. We may be sure, that all of them are not brought on by the inward workings of Gods Holy Spirit; since physicians have sometimes been able to remove them by the help of medicines.

Do I think then, either that all who are thus agitated, are cheats and impostors, or that they would all lose the inward feelings, which they fancy themselves to have, if they were put under the wholesome discipline of medicine? By no means. There are without doubt some sorts of madness, which, as no severity of the magistrate could quell, so no skill of the physician can cure.

CHARGE

CHARGE III.

*An examination of the doctrine of the
methodists concerning assurances.*

REVEREND BRETHREN ;

IN my discourse to you, when we last met together here^a, I examined the doctrine of the methodists concerning inward feelings in general : and I intend now to lay before you some observations on those in particular, which they call assurances. But there is so much contradiction and evasion in what they have written upon this subject, that it is scarce possible to collect from thence any consistent opinion, which they will abide by. Amongst other things they certainly teach,^b that “ it is a privilege of the followers of “ Christ to be assured of their pardon, and of “ their

^a See charge ii.

^b Michael Linniers account of this matter was ; that “ the leading of the Spirit is different in different “ souls. His more usual method is to give in one “ and the same moment the forgiveness of sins, and “ a full assurance of forgiveness. Yet in many he “ acts otherwise, giving first the remission of sins, “ and after some weeks, or months, or years the full “ assurance of it.” Wesleys journal from Feb. 1.

“ their eternal salvation by the witness of the
 “ Holy Spirit ; that his more usual method is,
 “ to give remission of sins, and a full assu-
 “ rance of it in one and the same moment ;
 “ but that he frequently acts otherwise, for
 “ many do not receive this assurance, till
 “ some

1737 — 8, &c. 2d edit. p. 59, 60. — Principles of a
 methodist, p. 17.

Mr. Wesleys “ general belief is, that every christian
 “ believer has a divine conviction of his reconciliation
 “ with God ; though he is inclined to think, that
 “ there may be some exceptions.” Orig. letters be-
 tween Mr. Wesley and Mr. Tompson, p. 51. — 37.

Whilst Mr. Wesley “ was declaring the free grace
 “ of God ; one, who had long continued in sin from
 “ a despair of finding mercy, received *a full, clear*
 “ *sense of his pardoning love, and power to sin no more.*”
 See his journal from Aug. 12. 1738. &c. p. 42.

In Mr. Whitefields opinion, “ it is a dreadful
 “ mistake to deny the doctrine of assurances ; — joy
 “ in the Holy Ghost, which is the consequence of
 “ assurance, is a necessary part of the kingdom of hea-
 “ ven within us ; — though all are not to be con-
 “ demned, who have not an immediate assurance, yet
 “ all ought to labour after it ; — one great reason, why
 “ so many go mourning all their life long is owing to
 “ their ignorance of their *christian privileges* ; they
 “ have not *assurance*, because they ask it not ; they ask
 “ it not, because they are taught, that it does not be-
 “ long to christians of these last days ; whereas he
 “ knows numbers, whose *salvation is written upon*
 “ *their hearts as it were with a sun-beam.*” He con-
 “ cludes with praying to Christ, “ that he would en-
 “ lighten *all christians to see their privileges*, and would
 “ never let them cease wrestling with him ; till he
 “ blesses them, by *assuring them of their eternal salva-*
 “ *tion.*” Whitefields journal 5th, p. 68, 69.

“ some weeks, or months, or years after their
 “ sins are forgiven, and many, for want of
 “ being informed, that it is one of their pri-
 “ vileges, do not ask for it, and so go mourn-
 “ ing all their life long for want of it.”

The evidence of their own inward feelings,
 which they sometimes alledge, under the
 name of ^c experiences, in support of this doc-
 trine, if it was in all other respects unexcep-
 tionable, could only shew, in what manner
 God has dealt with them, and not in what
 manner

* See Wesleys journal from Feb. 1. 1737—8, &c.
 p. 57.—74. Original letters &c. p. 19.—Mr. Wesley
 himself, “ on the 24th of May, 1738, about a quarter
 “ before nine o’clock in the evening, felt his heart
 “ strangely warmed, felt he did trust in Christ; Christ
 “ alone for salvation; and assurance was given him,
 “ that Christ had taken away *his* sins, even *his*.” But
 notwithstanding this experience he “ doubted the next
 “ day, whether he believed or not.” Journal from
 Feb. 1. 1737—8, &c. p. 29, 30, 31.—Mr. Whitefield
 too, besides the experience of those, “ whose salvation
 “ is written upon their heart as with a sun-beam” men-
 tions his own. But he seems either to have had some
 secret distrust, whether his assurance came from God,
 or else would have his readers believe, that Gods
 hatred to sin is not so great as his own. “ I under-
 “ went, says he, inexpressible agonies of soul for two
 “ or three days, at the remembrance of my sins, and
 “ the bitter consequences of them. Surely my sor-
 “ rows were *so* great, that had not God, in the *midst*
 “ of them, comforted my soul the load would have
 “ been insupportable! All the while I was assured
 “ God had *forgiven me*, but I could not *forgive myself*,
 “ for sinning against so much light and love.”

manner he deals with all true believers. But one of them has taught us, that this kind of evidence is not to be depended upon, by allowing, that “^d some amongst his followers, though they had not this assurance, have yet presumptuously imagined, that they had it.” What has confessedly happened to some, may happen to more, or even to all; they may mistake their own fancies for divine impressions, and may ascribe to the Spirit of God what is only the effect of their own presumption. Many of them have perhaps as strong a persuasion, as they profess themselves to have, that their present pardon and eternal salvation are witnessed to them by the Holy Ghost: nor can such a persuasion be in their mind without being perceived, or, to use their own language, without being felt. But it is one thing to perceive, that they have this persuasion; it is another thing to perceive, that it was produced by the Spirit of God. And all their experiences may be only the conceits of a presumptuous heart and an over-heated imagination; if their mind cannot feel him acting upon it, so as to distinguish between his manner of working and its own. But I have already shewn their pretensions to such an inward feeling, as this, to be vain and groundless, and will therefore not trouble you with a repetition of what you have heard from me before, but will pass on to their other arguments.

It

^d Remarks on the comparison of methodists and papists. p. 32.

It appears, they say, ^e " from the nature of
 " the thing, that assurance of present pardon
 " is a privilege of all true believers : for chris-
 " tian faith, or, as they more frequently call
 " it, justifying faith is a divine evidence or
 " conviction, not only that God was in Christ
 " reconciling the world unto himself, but a
 " sure trust and confidence, that Christ loved
 " *me* and gave himself for *me* : and this direct-
 " ly implies a strong conviction of *my* being
 " reconciled to God." Before we examine this
 account of christian faith ; let us consider what
 conclusion it will lead us to. If the nature of
 a true faith in Christ implies, that each per-
 son, who has it, is convinced or assured by a
 divine evidence, that he is reconciled to God ;
 remission of sins and an assurance of remis-
 sion must always be given in one and the same
 moment : because, whether faith be, as they
 think, the only condition, or, as we think, a
 necessary condition, of obtaining forgiveness ;
 both parties are agreed, that no one, accord-
 ing to the terms of the christian covenant,
 can obtain forgiveness without it. In the
 mean time they teach, ^f that the pardon of
 our sins and an assurance of our being par-
 doned, not only may be, but frequently are,
 separated ; so that many persons receive the
 one some weeks, or months, or years before
 they receive the other. Such is the incon-
 sistency between their doctrine and the argu-
 ment,

^e Wesley's farther appeal &c. P. i. p. 3. Orig. let-
 ters &c. p. 38. 19.

^f See above at p. 1. 2.

ment, by which they endeavour to support it. Sometimes indeed they distinguish between [§] the first sense of forgiveness, which has often doubts and fears mixed with it, and what they call a *full* assurance of faith, which admits of neither. But they have precluded themselves from making use of this distinction. They cannot say, that the first sense of present pardon is sufficient to justify a man; but that the *full* assurance of faith may be given to him afterwards: both because they ^b “ warn “ their hearers not to think themselves justified, before they have a *clear* assurance, that “ God has forgiven their sins, bringing with “ it a calm peace, the love of God, and “ *dominion over all sin*,” and likewise because they describe faith in general to be ⁱ a *demonstrative evidence*, and justifying faith in particular to be a *sure trust and confidence*: for a clear assurance of pardon joined with a power to sin no more, which yet is not a full assurance; a demonstrative evidence, which leaves room for doubts; and a sure trust or confidence, which has fears and misgivings mixed with it; are wholly unintelligible.

But

§ Mr. Wesley writes thus to Mr. Tompson, “ you “ think, full assurance excludes all doubt. I think “ so too. But there may be faith without full assurance. And these lower degrees of faith do not “ exclude doubts, which frequently mingle therewith “ more or less.” Orig. letters &c. p. 39. — “ I believe “ there is a degree of justifying faith, and consequently “ a state of justification short of, and commonly antecedent to the full assurance of faith.” Wesleys journal from Nov. 1. 1739. &c. p. 19.

But their argument, besides being inconsistent with their doctrine, is false in its first principle. Christian faith can neither be a full assurance nor any assurance at all of present pardon and acceptance with God. A sure trust and confidence, that Christ loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*, is such an expression, as admits of two different senses. It may mean, a sure trust and confidence, that through the death of Christ I have actually received the forgiveness of my sins; or it may mean a sure trust and confidence, that through his death the pardon of my sins is offered to me. We have not a true christian faith; if we do not trust, that Christ died for *us* in the latter sense; that ^k he came into the world to save sinners and *us* amongst the rest; and that ^l Gods promises of pardon and acceptance through his blood will be made good to *us*, if we observe the conditions, which are annexed to them. This trust and confidence may rise so high, as to be properly called ^m a full assurance of faith: nor shall I venture to determine,

^k See the same journal p. 51.

^l "Faith is *πιστις* *ἐν* *ἀόρατοις* & *ἀφανήτοις* the demonstrative evidence of things unseen." Wesley's earnest appeal to men of reason and religion. p. 4.

"Faith in general is a divine, supernatural *πιστις*

"[evidence or conviction] of things not seen,—justifying faith implies—a *sure trust and confidence*, that

"Christ died for *my* sins," &c. Wesley's farther appeal &c. P. i. p. 3.

^m 1 Tim. i. 15.

ⁿ Ephes. i. 7. Acts ii. 38. x. 43. xxvi. 18. 20. Joh. i. 12.

^o Heb. x. 22.

termine, whether any lower degree than this, will be sufficient to satisfy one of the conditions of our justification. But an assurance of this sort is not the same with those, which are the subject of our present enquiry. Such an assurance, as this, " " comes by hearing, " and hearing by the word of God ;" we acquire it by the study of the scriptures, and by searching into the foundation of those promises, which are contained in them ; and whatever assistance we may receive, in acquiring it, from the Spirit of God ; he does not impress it upon our minds by an immediate revelation : it is an assurance, that we may obtain forgiveness and acceptance through Christ, if we are not wanting to ourselves, and not that we have obtained them already : it is an assurance of Gods veracity, and not of our own eternal salvation.

When the methodists define a justifying faith to be a sure trust and confidence, that Christ loved *me* ; and gave himself for *me* ; they use this expression in the other sense, and

* Rom. x. 17.

• " A divine conviction of my being reconciled to God is directly implied — in a divine conviction, that Christ loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*. " Orig. let. p. 38.

" Christian faith implies a divine evidence or conviction of our acceptance." — See the same letters P. 34.

" A divine conviction of pardon is directly implied " in the evidence or conviction of things unseen." Same letters p. 19.

" My

and mean, that it is a sure trust and confidence of *my* having actually obtained forgiveness through the death of Christ: for they explain themselves by saying, that ° “ it directly implies a divine conviction of pardon, “ a conviction of my being reconciled to God “ and accepted by him.” But can a mans justifying faith be such a faith, as implies a conviction or assurance of his being justified? I know, that sometimes, when they are pressed, they ^p disclaim this opinion. In the mean time they explain “ justification to be a present forgiveness, pardon of sins, and consequently acceptance with God:” and, as we have just now seen, they teach that an assurance or conviction of present pardon, reconciliation, and acceptance with God is directly implied in a justifying faith: so that upon their own principles ^a it is in all respects exactly the same thing, whether they say, that a mans justifying faith directly implies a conviction of his being pardoned, reconciled and accepted with God, or that a mans justifying faith directly implies a conviction of his being justified. Whether therefore they ever use these precise words or not; they

“ My belief in general is, that every christian believer has a divine conviction of his reconciliation to God.” Same letters p. 51.

^p Mr. Wesley writes thus to Mr. Tompson; “ I agree with you, that justifying faith cannot be a conviction, that I am justified.” Same letters p. 20.

^a “ Justification means present forgiveness pardon of sins, and consequently acceptance with God.” Wesleys farther appeal &c. P. i. p. 2.

they certainly hold this opinion: and we may go on to ask them; whether such a faith as this goes before or follows after justification? If it follows after justification it cannot be a justifying faith: because a justifying faith, as the words import, is a condition to be performed on our part in order to our justification. And if it goes before justification it can neither be a justifying faith, nor be produced in us by any act of the Holy Ghost: because a conviction of our being justified, before we are justified, is a conviction of a falshood.

Perhaps they may answer, that a justifying faith is neither antecedent nor subsequent to our justification; but that in the same moment, in which we have this faith, we are pardoned and accepted; and in the same moment, in which we are pardoned and accepted, we have this faith. It would take up too much of your time; if I was to enquire at present, what are the necessary conditions of our justification: I will therefore allow them to suppose, that a lively faith, or such a faith, as is in its own nature fruitful of good works, is the only condition. Upon this supposition they

“ You say you believe.— You do well, the devils
 “ also believe and tremble. But has your faith,
 “ which you pretend to, influenced your hearts, re-
 “ newed your souls, and like *Abrahams* worked by
 “ love!— Has it enabled you to overcome the world,
 “ and strengthened you to give up your *Isaacs*, your
 “ laughter, your most beloved lusts, friends, pleasures
 “ and profits for God? If so, take the comfort of it;
 “ for justly may you say; we know assuredly, that we

they may easily prove, that a lively faith and our justification in the sight of God must always go together: because as soon as we have faith, he can discern at once, whether it is a lively faith, or not. But the proper question now before us is; not whether our faith and our justification in the sight of God; but whether our faith and our own assurance, that we are justified in his sight, always go together? As soon as we have faith, we may, by reflecting on what passes within us, perceive, that we have it: but, though God can immediately discern, it will take us up some time to inform ourselves, of what sort our faith is. For what if we perceive, that we are able to restrain our vicious appetites; when there are no temptations at hand to excite and inflame them? What if we find ourselves disposed to do good to mankind; when we have either no objects of our benevolence near us, or such only, as we can relieve without any great trouble or expence to ourselves? What if we admire the beauty and excellence of virtue; when we are retired from action, and contemplate upon it in our closet? A lively faith differs

“do fear and love God, or rather are loved of him.
 “But if you are only talking consenters, and have
 “only a faith of the head, and never felt the power
 “of it in your hearts, however you may bolster yourselves up, and say; we have *Abraham* for our father,
 “or *Christ* for our Saviour; unless you get a faith
 “working by love, you shall never sit with *Abraham*,
 “*Isaac*, *Jacob*, or *Jesus Christ* in the kingdom of heaven.” Whitefields nine sermons p. 87. 88.

differs from a dead one in nothing, but in name; if those passions, which it can govern, when they make no resistance, overrule its authority, as soon as they are heated and become importunate; if it raises in us only a speculative love of piety and virtue, but leaves us indifferent about the practice of them; if it appears to be vigorous, and promises to bring forth much fruit, only in the calm season and sunshine of life, but when it happens to be exposed to storms and tempests, soon fades and withers, without bringing any fruit to perfection. In order therefore to know, whether our faith is a lively one, or a dead one; we must have searched our hearts with great care and attention, and must have made trial of ourselves in the several circumstances and conditions, through which we are to pass. It would be nothing to the purpose to reply here, that in the same moment, in which we have a lively faith, God can impress upon our minds a clear evidence of its nature: for whatever he can do, if it is his pleasure; St. Paul by commanding the Corinthians "to examine themselves, whether they were in the faith, and to prove their own selves," has taught us, that such an impression is not connected with the religion of Christ.

These

* 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

* Wesley's earnest appeal, &c. p. 27.

" In Mr. Wesley's account; "that *we have our sins pardoned*, if we do not know they are pardoned, cannot bind us either to love or obedience." Farther

These new teachers, in order to prove, that a sense of Gods having pardoned our sins is implied in a christian faith, sometimes appeal " to a witness in the breast of all, " who love God : for if we ask any of these ; " How they, when they were sinners, came " to love God at first ? — they will own, that " they did not love him, till they were sensible, that he loved *them* ; and whatever expression they make use of to denote his love towards them, it will always be found upon examination to imply forgiveness. Confidence in a pardoning God is from hence judged to be essential to true faith, and forgiveness of sins to be one of the first of those unseen things, of which faith is the evidence." The answer, which they here put into the mouths of converted sinners, when it is rightly understood, is agreeable to what St. John writes ; " We love God ; because he first loved us. Herein is love ; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins." But the same apostle teaches us to consider the son of God as the propitiation for *our* sins in the same manner, as he is the propitiation for the sins of all mankind : for having elsewhere said ; * " If any man sin, we

have
ther appeal, &c. p. 31. But does not our knowing, that God has promised to pardon them through the redemption, which is in Christ, if we will rely upon the truth of this promise, and break off our sins by righteousness, oblige us to love and obedience, without knowing, that we are actually pardoned ?

* 1 John iv. 19. 10.

“ have an advocate with the Father, Jesus
 “ Christ the righteous, and he is the propi-
 “ tiation for our sins ; ” he immediately adds ;
 “ And not for ours only, but also for the
 “ sins of the whole world.” Christ is the pro-
 piation for the sins of the whole world, not
 because all mankind have actually obtained
 remission of sins through him, but because
 through him remission of sins is offered to all
 mankind. And in like manner, the love of
 God towards sinners consists, not in their
 actually obtaining pardon, but in his sending
 his Son to atone for their sins and to put it
 into their power to obtain pardon, if they will.
 How indeed should it be otherwise ? His pro-
 viding an atonement for them, and making
 them an offer of pardon, is *his* act ; whereas
 their obtaining the benefit of this offer de-
 pends upon *theirs* : and his love towards them
 must necessarily consist in what he has done
 for them, and not in what they are to do for
 themselves. Nor is it an instance of greater
 love to pardon their sins, when they perform
 the conditions, which he has prescribed to
 them ; than it was to make them an offer
 of pardon, provided they would perform
 them. We may therefore allow ; “ that
 “ converted sinners, before they love God, are
 “ sensible of his love towards them ; that
 “ trust in a pardoning God is essential to true
 “ faith ; and that the forgiveness of sins is the
 “ first of those invisible things, of which faith
 “ is the evidence ; ” if these expressions are un-
 derstood

derstood in the only sense, which scripture and reason will warrant ; if the love of God towards them is understood to consist in the sending of his Son into the world to put it into their power to obtain salvation ; and not in their being actually saved ; if by trust in a pardoning God is meant trust in God, who has offered them a pardon ; and not, who has already pardoned them ; and if by faith in the forgiveness of sins is meant a sure trust and confidence, that Gods promise of forgiveness will be made good to them, whenever they perform the conditions annexed to it ; and not that they have performed these conditions, and are now forgiven.

“ But whether conviction of present pardon is implied, or not, in a true christian faith ; can there be any absurdity in supposing ; that, when God pardons a mourning broken-hearted sinner, his mercy necessarily obliges him to another act, to comfort this mourner by witnessing to his spirit, that his sins are pardoned ?” Without stopping here to enquire ; whether “ God can with any propriety be said to be necessarily obliged by his mercy ;” we may answer this question by asking another : Can a sincere penitent find no divine consolation, without having an immediate revelation from the Holy Ghost to inform him, that his sins are forgiven ? God has promised in the scriptures,

* Original letters between Mr. Wesley and Mr. Tompson, p. 19. 38.

* See the same letters, p. 27.

tures, that, if we will repent of our sins and believe in Christ, we shall be received into his favour. As far therefore as we can find by an impartial examination and tryal of ourselves, that we have complied with these conditions, so far we have the word of God to comfort us. And whoever presumes to promise sinners any consolation, which the Holy Ghost will administer to them, when they mourn for their sins, whether they break them off by righteousness, or not; he is either shamefully ignorant of the religion of Christ, or impiously perverts it.

St. Paul indeed says, that the followers of Christ^b “ receive the Spirit of adoption, “ whereby they cry, Abba, Father; the Spirit “ itself bearing witness with their Spirit, that “ they are the children of God.” But if we understand him to mean, that it is one of our privileges, as we are Christs disciples, to have an assurance of present pardon and eternal salvation impressed upon our minds by the Spirit of God, and that this is the witness of the Spirit, which gives us a right to call God our Father; it would in every part of our lives be repugnant to our condition to address ourselves to him in that form of words, which Christ has commanded us to use in our daily devotion: before we have received this witness of the Spirit, it

^b Rom. viii. 15. 16.

^c “ The anabaptists of Moravia, who were disciples “ of *Huter*, and are therefore called by *Zeiler Huterian breibren*,” chose, in one of these particulars at least, to be consistent with themselves, rather than to conform

it would be presumptuous to say ; *Our Father, which art in heaven* ; and after we have received it, we must either distrust Gods veracity, or must have no meaning at all, when we say ; *Forgive us our trespasses*. The doctrine of the apostle therefore would by this interpretation of it be rendered inconsistent with the commands of his Master.

The methodists, I believe, in their general practice make use of the Lords prayer, as it was delivered by Christ. So that such amongst them, as have not yet persuaded themselves, that they feel the Spirit of adoption witnessing with their spirit, that they are children of God, cry, Abba, Father : and such as, pretend to have been assured by it, that their sins are already pardoned, continue after this to pray to God to forgive them their trespasses. I have indeed been told that one of their leaders, when he was expounding this petition, *Forgive us our trespasses, &c.* in one of their congregations, where such, as imagined themselves to have been assured of forgiveness, were placed by themselves, addressed himself to them in words to this effect ; “ As to you, my brethren, who have received the witness of the Spirit, by which you are assured, that your pardon is sealed in heaven ; it is not only unnecessary, but would be inconsistent “ with

conform to the law of Christ : “ for they omitted this part of the Lords prayer, *Forgive us our trespasses, &c.* because being regenerated, they esteemed themselves to be without sin :” Picarts Ceremonies and customs, &c. V. vi. P. i. p. 173.

“ with the happy state, at which you are arrived, to pray to God for this blessing.” But it is of little importance, whether this account is true or not : for if they leave out any petition of the prayer, which Christ commanded his disciples to make use of, they oppose their authority to his ; and if they do not, their practice is inconsistent with their doctrine.

Having thus proved, that the witness of the Spirit, by which he testifies with our spirit, that we are children of God, is not an assurance of present pardon and salvation impressed upon our minds by the influence of the Holy Ghost, I should have gone on to enquire what it is ; if our late excellent and learned diocesan had not made this unnecessary by ‘ shewing in that masterly manner, which was peculiar to himself, that it consists in the evidence of those good affections, which the Spirit of God excites or confirms in us by such means, as the mind cannot discern by any inward feelings, of such a power, as his imperceptible influence supplies us with, to restrain and subdue our fleshly appetites, and of those good works, which his secret assistances enable us to perform. It would be very difficult to reckon up the several degrees of this evidence, and to distinguish them exactly from one another. They are different according to the different progress, which we have made in the love and practice of our christian duty. As soon as we begin to correct
our

^a Sherlocks discourses, V. i. p. 227, &c.

our vicious appetites ; though we are then only entering upon a christian life, and therefore cannot assure ourselves, that we are such, as God requires us to be ; yet if we approach him with humility and reverence, like children, who hope, that their behaviour is such, as may in some degree be pleasing to their offended parents, but are afraid at the same time, that it may be otherwise ; we may venture, in obedience to the commands and through the merits of Christ, to call him *our Father*. And as long as we continue in this world, we ought to be always ^e “ pressing forward towards the mark for the prize of our high calling of God in Christ Jesus,” and never to think, that we have arrived at such a degree of perfection, as can make it unnecessary or improper for us to pray to God *to forgive us our trespasses* : for St. James teaches us, that ^f “ in many things we offend all ;” and St. John, that ^g “ if we say, we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”

There is no occasion to enter very far into the enquiry, whether the evidence, of which I am now speaking, can ever rise so high, as not to leave in our minds the least doubt or fear about our being in a state of favour with God. For such assurances, as these, if they were to be had, would, like some others already mentioned, be very different

^e Philip. iii. 14. ^f Jam. iii. 2. ^g 1 Joh. i. 8.

ferent from ^h those, which the methodists pretend to. These could be obtained no otherwise, than by a diligent examination of our heart, and a careful and impartial review of our conduct; whereas theirs are supposed to be impressed upon the mind by an immediate act of the Holy Spirit: the former could be the lot of such only, if there be any such, as have arrived at a state of christian perfection; and the methodists themselves, though they contend, that there are some, who arrive at this state, yet allow ⁱ them to be very few in number; whilst the latter are represented as a common privilege of all believers, and as being unconnected with the question about christian perfection: the former would be only assurances of our being in favour with God at present, but not of our necessary perseverance in our christian duty, and consequently not of our eternal salvation; whereas the latter are supposed to be attended with a power to sin no more, and to be assurances of eternal salvation, as well as of present pardon and acceptance.

St. Pauls assurance, that “ ^k the Lord the
“ righteous judge would give him a crown of
“ glory

^k See above, p. 45, 46. — Mr. Wesley having put the question, “ Whether a gradual improvement in
“ grace and goodness is not a good *foundation* of an
“ assurance of a gospel new birth,” gives the following answer. “ If by grace and goodness be meant the know-
“ ledge and love of God through Christ; our daily
“ growing in them is a good *proof*, that we are born
“ of

"glory in the day of retribution," was derived, as he plainly intimates, from finding, upon a review of his conduct, that he "had fought a good fight, had finished his course, and had kept the faith." And if they, who sometimes insist upon this example, were to be asked, why his confidence must be allowed to include in it the highest degree of certainty? I know of no answer, which they could give, except, that he was an inspired apostle: and in this answer we may see such a difference between him and common christians, as will not suffer us to conclude, that our confidence must necessarily rise to the same degree of certainty with his. Nor let any one imagine, that a confidence, which is derived from trying and examining ourselves, is not such an assurance, as a christian ought to have; because it will always be mixed with some doubts and fears arising, if not from a sense, that our obedience has been imperfect, yet at least from an apprehension, that it may have

"of the Spirit. But this does by no means supersede the *previous witness* of Gods Spirit with ours, that we are the children of God. And this is properly the *foundation* of the assurance of faith." Farther appeal, &c. P. i. p. 24.

¹ Mr. Wesley thinks them to be so few, that no two of them ever did or ever will meet together in marriage. "As to christian perfection, I believe, says he, that two, who were made perfect in love, never did, or will, marry together." Orig. letters, &c. p. 20.

^k 2 Tim. iv. 7. 8.

have been imperfect in some instances, which have escaped our notice. For we are commanded by the same apostle “¹ to work out “our salvation with fear and trembling:” and that we might not expect any infallible evidence of our having finished this work, before we leave the world; St. Peter commands us,^m “as we are worshippers of the “Father, who without respect of persons “judgeth according to every mans work, to “pass the time of our sojourning here in “fear.”

¹ Philip. ii. 21. ^m 1 Pet. i. 7.

CHARGE IV.

An enquiry, whether the article of the resurrection of the body, or flesh, was not inserted into the public creeds before the middle of the fourth century; and whether the language of it is not agreeable to the language of the scriptures: in answer to a posthumous pamphlet of the late Dr. Sykes.

REVEREND BRETHREN;

AFTER the ministers of the gospel have for some time been lamenting the great encrease of infidelity in these kingdoms, and have been endeavouring to find out the cause of this evil, that they may know the better how to apply a proper remedy; they are at length directed by a late writer to look for the true cause of it amongst themselves*. He observes, that we have quite changed the truths

* Dr. Sykes's *Enquiry, when the resurrection of the body or flesh was first inserted into the public creeds*, p. 50, 51, 52, and the two last pages of the preface.

The doctors title does not include the whole contents of his pamphlet: for he endeavours to prove,
both

truths of christianity by our interpretations of them ; that what we profess under the notion of a christian faith has, in more instances than one, been rendered inconsistent with common sense by departing from the language of the scriptures ; and then concludes, that men will naturally reject the truths of the gospel, when they see things taught, as the fundamental doctrines of it, which they cannot comprehend or understand. He thinks himself warranted to make such reflections, as these, by what appeared to him to be the result of an enquiry concerning the time, when the article of *a resurrection of the flesh or of the body* was first inserted into the public or baptismal creeds. The scriptures frequently mention a resurrection in general, and a resurrection *of the dead* : but he cannot find, either that they say any thing about a resurrection *of the body*, or that this article ever made

part both that this article was not in the public creeds before the middle of the fourth century ; and likewise, that the language of it is not agreeable to the language of the scriptures.

^b Dr. Sykes takes no notice of this creed, till he comes to sum up his evidence at the conclusion of his enquiry : and then, at p. 49, he calls it *Cyril's creed*. But any one, who looks into Cyril's lectures, may see, that the creed, which he explains in them, was the baptismal creed of the church of Jerusalem. And he plainly shews, that the article in question was contained in it, when he says ; " Let the confession of faith, "
 " [τῆς πίστεως ἐπαγγελία,] which we have again delivered to you, be carefully remembered by you ; as
 " we

part of a public creed, before the middle of the fourth century.

This question, though the examination of it will afford very little entertainment, is of importance enough to bespeak our attention. I shall therefore enquire; whether this writer is not mistaken in both parts of it? that is, whether this article had not a place in the public creeds much earlier than the time, which he has fixed; and whether the language of it is not justified by the manner, in which the scriptures speak of the resurrection?

The resurrection *of the flesh* was a distinct article in the creed expounded by ^b Cyril to the candidates for baptism at Jerusalem in his catechetical lectures. The year 347 is the most probable date of these lectures; and the whole turn of them, as well as the occasion of reading them, shews, that the creed, which is expounded in them, was the baptismal creed of the church of Jerusalem. But what was then

“ we read it. In this confession of faith is contained
 “ what follows; — *in one baptism of repentance for*
 “ *the remission of sins, and in one [holy] catholic church,*
 “ [*καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν*] *and in the resurrection of*
 “ *the flesh, and in the life everlasting;* — and we
 “ have already spoken of baptism and repentance in
 “ our former lectures.” Cyrill. Hierosol. op. Oxon.
 1703. p. 269. Bulli iudicium ecclesiæ catholicæ, &c.
 p. 48, &c.

If any one is in doubt, whether the *Πολύλογον*, to whom these lectures are addressed, were the candidates for baptism, or not; he may consult this edition of Cyril p. 1. not. 3. or Bingham's antiquities, &c. B. x. c. ii. §. v.

then the standing creed of this church had probably been introduced long before. Certainly the date of it is more early than the year 325, when the council of Nice met: because though it plainly asserts the divinity of the Son of God, yet it does not use the word *ὁμοουσίος*, which is well known to be the distinguishing mark of such creeds, as were copied from the decree of that council.

^d Marcellus bishop of Ancyra, having been deprived of his office by a synod holden at Con-

^c Καὶ [εἰς] ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ὑιὸν τῆ Θεῆ μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τῆ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, Θεὸν ἀληθινόν, δι' ὃ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· κ. τ. λ. "And in
" one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of
" God, begotten of the Father before all worlds,
" very God, by whom all things were made, &c."
Cyr. p. 111, 135, 141. Bulli judicium, &c. p. 48.
Hiflor. literar. per Cave, Colon. 1720. p. 133.

^d Hiflor. literar. per Cave, p. 126, 127. Athanasii op. Paris. 1698. V. i. p. 150. — Marcellus's creed was; "I believe in God Almighty; and in Christ Jesus, his only Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried, and the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, whence he cometh to judge the quick and the dead; and in the Holy Ghost; the holy church; the remission of sins; [*σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν*] the resurrection of the flesh; and life everlasting." Epiphani. oper. Paris. 1622. V. i. p. 836.

About the year 422, the Roman or western creed, as we learn from Maximus Taurinensis, was; "Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem; et in Jesum Christum
" tum

Constantinople, went a few years afterwards to Rome ; and after staying there fifteen months he delivered his creed to Julius the bishop of this city, who approved of it, and received him into communion, about the year 341. One article in this creed is a resurrection *of the flesh* : and though to a slight observer it may appear to have been the creed only of a private person ; yet if we consider, that Marcellus seems to have been a man of some artifice ; that he had been long enough at Rome to

“ tum filium ejus unicum, dominum nostrum, qui
 “ natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine, qui sub
 “ Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus, tertio die
 “ resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad
 “ dexteram Patris, inde venturus judicare vivos et
 “ mortuos ; et in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam eccle-
 “ siam, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem.” Maxim. Taurinen. inter septem præfules
 christianos, edit. Lugduni 1633. Homil. de diversis.
 p. 239, 240.

This creed is transcribed six times in the homilies of Petrus Chrysologus, who was made bishop of Ravenna in the year 433. See his homilies from 57 to 62 inclusive. The copy, in hom. 61, agrees with this, which I have transcribed from Maximus Taurinensis. But the other five copies add — *vitam æternam* after *carnis resurrectionem*.

The resemblance between Marcellus's creed and this, when it is joined to the other circumstances mentioned above, leaves no room to doubt, that, when he declared his faith to Julius, he made this declaration in the words of the public creed of the church of Rome. And indeed Usher and Bingham call it the Roman creed without any hesitation : except only that

to be well informed what creed was in use there; that his creed is almost word for word the same with what was certainly the Roman or western creed, so early as the year 422, and probably much earlier; and that in consequence of his making this profession of his faith Julius received him into communion; we may see reason enough for believing, that the substance and even the form of it were copied from the public creeds of the western church.

* The creed, which Arius and Euzoius delivered to Constantine about the year 327, is said by our author to have been the first, wherein we meet with *a resurrection of the flesh* inserted as a distinct article. How truly this is said will appear presently. In the mean time we may observe, that this creed is generally believed by the best writers on the subject

the former says; “ verbo *Pallex* tantum in initio, “ *librarium*, ut videtur, incuria, omisso; et *vita* “ *eternæ* articulo in fine superaddito. Quem et in “ occidentis quibusdam partibus receptum fuisse, et ex “ Petro Ravennate, et ex auctore libri de symbolo ad “ catechumenos, tom. ix. op. Augustini, observo.” Usser. de Symbolis, p. 7. Bingham's antiq. B. x. c. iv. §. xii. I know of no entire copy of the Roman or western creed of an earlier date: but there is not the least reason to imagine, that this was not the public creed of the church of Rome, before Marcellus made use of it. Indeed though I have not met with an entire copy, which is more antient than his time; yet we shall see presently, that the church of Rome in Tertullians time, above 140 years before Marcellus was there,

ject to have been the public creed of the church of Alexandria. Or suppose it to have been, as he represents it, a private creed drawn up by themselves, there is no appearance of probability, that, when they were endeavouring to convince the emperor of the soundness of their faith, they would insert an article into their creed, which had never appeared in any public creed before.

Our enquirer observes, that, as this article was then a new one, so it was not received into other creeds, which are of a later date: “ for
“ though in a creed of the council of Sardica;
“ as it is preserved among the fragments of
“ Hilary; after the article relating to the Holy
“ Ghost, there are these four; *We believe in*
“ *the holy church, in the forgiveness of sins, in*
“ *the resurrection of the flesh, and in everlasting*
“ *life;*

there, professed to believe in “ God the creator of the
“ universe, in Jesus Christ the Son of God the creator,
“ that he was born of a virgin, and that there shall
“ be a *resurrection of the flesh.*”

* Enquiry, &c. p. 26—28. 44. The latter part of this creed is—“And in the Holy Ghost, [*ἁγίου πνεύματος*,] and in the resurrection of the flesh,
“ and in the life of the world to come, and in the
“ kingdom of heaven, and in one catholic church
“ from one end of the earth to the other.” Socrat.
hist. eccles. L. i. c. 25, 26. Usser. de Symbolis, p. 11.
Binghams antiq. B. x. c. iv. §. vii.

† Enquiry, &c. p. 35. “Credimus et in sanctam
“ ecclesiam, in remissionem peccatorum, in *carnis* re-
“ surrectionem, in vitam æternam.” In the Bene-
dictine edition of Hilarys works, Paris 1693, this
passage is at p. 1322, 1323.

“ *life* ; yet he takes notice of another form
 “ of this creed preserved by Hilary, in which
 “ the Sardican bishops only add ; *We be-*
 “ *lieve in the holy church, the forgiveness of sins,*
 “ *and in life everlasting* ; without saying any
 “ thing of the *resurrection of the flesh*.” If he
 had made use of the ^s most correct edition of
 Hilarys works, he would have found, that not
 only this one article, but that all the four are
 omitted in this second form. Here then I
 would ask how these articles, which are not to
 be found in one form of this creed, came to be
 inserted into the other ? He replies, that ^h “ they
 “ are an interpolation taken from the western
 “ creeds.” Certainly if they are an interpola-
 tion, they might as well be taken from the
 eastern, as from the western, creeds : for the
 Sardican council met in the year 347 ; and
 these,

^s Hilar. Pictav. opera per Benedictinos. Paris. 1693.
 p. 1173. 1174. — Here the last articles of the
 Sardican creed in this edition of Hilary are ; — “ Cre-
 “ dimus et in Spiritum Sanctum, hoc est paracletum,
 “ quem [Christus] promittens apostolis post reditum
 “ in coelos misit docere eos ac memorare omnia, per
 “ quem et sanctificantur sincere credentium animi ;”
 — and then it goes on to the usual anathemas. The
 editors say in a note ; — “ Epistola pseudo-synodi Sar-
 “ dicensis, fragmento iii. hæc exhibet — Credimus in
 “ sanctam ecclesiam, in remissionem peccatorum, in
 “ carnis resurrectionem, in vitam æternam ; — quæ
 “ verba, omiſſis in *carnis resurrectionem*, inde huc re-
 “ vocata sunt in editione Parisiensi ; cum neque in
 “ aliis editionibus extant neque in MSS neque in
 “ Græcis formulis.” Dr. Sykes unfortunately made
 use

these articles, as we learnⁱ from Cyril, were at this time in the standing creed of Jerusalem. But why does he suppose them to be an interpolation? — We may easily deny his supposition. And if we do; the truth of it can never be proved. Nay, we may go one step farther, and may suppose on the contrary, with equal reason, that the words in question, instead of being interpolated in one of these forms, were by the negligence of transcribers, omitted in the other.

It is very possible however to account for this difference in the two forms, without having recourse to either of these arbitrary suppositions. The Sardican council was employed in deliberating about the quality and person of the Son of God: the bishops therefore, who met in this council, having explained their opinion about this matter, and having mentioned the article of the Holy Ghost, as

the use of this Paris edition, which is the only copy of Hilary's works where the three articles, *of the holy church and remission of sins and eternal life*, are to be found without the fourth article *of the resurrection of the flesh*. He takes notice himself, that Baronius, and Binius, and Labbe cite this creed without adding any of these four articles after those, which relate to the Holy Ghost.

^h "As this is the first time this article is mentioned by any *eastern* council, and is not mentioned by any subsequent *eastern* council for many years; it seems to be an interpolation from the *western* creeds, in or after the days of Hilary." — Enquiry, &c. p. 35.

ⁱ See above at p. 63.

the first of those, about which all parties were agreed, might leave their draught of a creed to be filled up from other public creeds, which were then in use: and Hilary, when he recited this creed in one place, might stop where they did, and might in the other place fill it up agreeably to their intention.

But it is urged, that * "the article of a resurrection *of the flesh* could not be in the western creeds in the year 359: because if it had, so many bishops as then met at Ariminum from Italy, Gaul, Britain, and Spain, would certainly have taken notice of it; whereas nothing is said about it in their creed." Instead of applying to this council, as we reasonably might, what has been just now observed about the council of Sardica, let us rather try our enquirers argument in another instance. In the creed of Ariminum

* Enquiry, &c. p. 39, 41. There seems to have been a small slip of the doctors pen, where he says, as quoted in note ^h, that the article of the resurrection of the flesh, which we find in one copy of the creed of the Sardican council, seems to be an interpolation from the *western* creeds *in* or after the days of Hilary: for here he endeavours to shew, that this article was not in the *western* creeds in the year 359, that is, *in* the days of Hilary.

¹ The latter part of this creed is — "And in the Holy Ghost, whom the only begotten Son of God Jesus Christ promised to send to mankind; according to what is written; I go unto my Father; and I will pray the Father, and he will send you another comforter, the Spirit of truth; he shall take of me, and shall teach you all things, and bring all things into your remembrance." Socrat. L. ii. c. 37.

no mention is made about obtaining *remission of sins and eternal life in the church of Christ*. Shall we therefore conclude, that these articles were not in any baptismal creed of the western church before the time of that council? This conclusion would certainly be false: for we learn from Cyprian, who lived a hundred years before, that ^m “ the Novatianists used “ the words of a catholic creed in baptism, “ when they asked ; *Dost thou believe in life “ everlasting and remission of sins through the holy “ church?* — though they could not express the “ same faith by them, as the catholic church “ expressed.” Cyprian, who was an African bishop, and at the same time well acquainted with the state of the western church, would not have called this creed a catholic one, if he had not known it to be a received creed in this church, as well as in his own. And we are

^m “ Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut dicat, eandem “ Novatianum tenere legem, quam catholica ecclesia “ teneat; eodem symbolo, quo et nos, baptizare; eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, “ eundem Spiritum sanctum ; ac propter hoc usurpare “ eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in “ interrogatione baptismi a nobis non discrepare ; sciat “ quisquis hoc opponendum putat, primum non esse “ unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem, neque “ eandem interrogationem : nam cum dicunt ; — Credis “ remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam ; — mentiuntur in interrogatione ; “ quando non habeant ecclesiam. Tunc deinde voce “ sua ipsi confitentur remissionem peccatorum non “ dari, nisi per sanctam ecclesiam, posse, quam non “ habentes ostendunt remitti illic peccata non posse.” Cyprian. Amstel. 1700. epist ad Magnum. p. 296.

are the more sure, that it was a received creed of the western church in particular ; because this was the church, in which Novatian had been brought up, and in which he claimed episcopal authority. How then can the silence of the council of Ariminum, about a resurrection of the body, be any evidence, that there was no such article in the western creeds at the time of this council ; when the bishops, who met there from Italy, Gaul, Britain, and Spain, are equally silent about some other articles, which we are sure were in the western creeds a century before?

By removing one difficulty, I have led myself into another : for Cyprian says nothing about a resurrection *of the flesh* ; though he takes notice of at least two of the other articles, which we find in the creed of Sardica, as quoted in Hilarys fragments. But the question, which was then before him, related to the validity of baptism administered by the Novatianists : and he argues, that notwithstanding they in their baptismal interrogatories made use of a catholic creed, yet they must necessarily prevaricate, when they asked ; *Dost thou believe in life everlasting and remission of sins through the holy church ?* because the benefits

ⁿ Videamus quid didicerit [ecclesia Romæ,] quid docuerit, cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis *confesserarit*. “ Unum Deum novit, creatorem universitatis ; et “ Christum Jesum ex virgine Maria, Filium Dei ; et “ carnis resurrectionem.” Tertull. Lutet. Paris. 1675. De præscript. hæretic. p. 215. In the translation of this passage I have followed the reading *confestatur*, which

nefits of remission of fins and eternal life could not be bestowed in fuch baptism, as was administered by those, who had separated themselves from the church of Christ, in which church alone these benefits were to be obtained; as the words of these interrogatories declare. The articles therefore, which are mentioned by him, were to his purpose: but a resurrection of the flesh, in which both the just and unjust, both those, who continue members of the church of Christ, and those, who desert it, will be raised, is an article, which he would of course omit; as it had no connexion with his argument.

But if we had seen no particular reason, why Cyprian, whilst he recites some other articles, which are wanting in the creed of Ariminum, should omit this; yet his silence about it would not have been sufficient to prove, that it made no part of the Roman and African creeds; when we have the positive evidence of ^a Tertullian, that it was in both of them fifty years before the time of Cyprian, that is, as early as the year 192 or thereabouts. “ The church of Rome, says he, bears witness
“ with the church of Africa, in acknowledging
“ one God the creator of the universe, and
“ Jesus

which is the least to my purpose; and is of the least authority. If the genuine word was *contesserarit*, or, as others have it, *contesseratur*; Tertullian's evidence without any comment upon it, will be a plain declaration, that the *tessera* or *symbols* or *creeds* of these two churches concurred in this article of a resurrection of the flesh. See Bingham's antiquities, &c. B. x. c. iii. §. ii.

“ Jesus Christ, the Son of God the creator,
 “ born of a virgin, and the resurrection of the
 “ *flesh*.” This I call a positive evidence of
 Tertullian, because the attestation of these
 churches could only be collected from the ar-
 ticles, which were contained in the public
 creeds of both.

Tertullian indeed in a ° summary of the
 christian faith, which is in his treatise against
Praxeas, makes no mention of the resurrec-
 tion of the flesh. But we have no reason to
 think, that this summary is any thing more,
 than an abstract of such parts of a baptismal
 creed, as related to the question between him
 and Praxeas, who denied, that the Father, Son,
 and Holy Ghost are three distinct persons.

In the writings of Tertullian there are two
 other forms of professing the christian faith.

He
 ° Enquiry, &c. p. 14, 15. “ Unicum quidem Deum
 “ credimus.—Dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et Filius, sermo
 “ ipſius, qui ex ipſo proceſſerit, per quem omnia facta
 “ ſunt, et ſine quo factum eſt nihil. Hunc miſſum a Pa-
 “ tre in virginem, et ex ea natum, hominem et Deum,
 “ filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jeſum
 “ Chriſtum; hunc paſſum, hunc mortuum et ſe-
 “ pultum ſecundum ſcripturas et reſuſcitatum a Patre,
 “ et in coelos reſumptum, federe ad dextram Patris,
 “ venturum judicare vivos et mortuos; qui exinde
 “ miſerit, ſecundum promiſſionem ſuam, a Patre Spi-
 “ ritum Sanctum, paracletum, ſanctificatorem fidei
 “ eorum, qui credunt in Patrem, et Filium, et Spi-
 “ ritum Sanctum.” Tertull. adverſus Praxeam. p. 501.
 He adds; “ Hanc regulam ab initio evangelii decu-
 “ curriſſe, etiam ante priores quoſque hæreticos, ne-
 “ dum ante Praxeam heſternum, &c.” From hence

we

He calls one of them, which is in his treatise *de virginibus velandis*, the invariable rule of faith: and this is well known to be another name for a creed. One article in this rule of faith is, that "Christ shall come to judge the quick and the dead, even by the resurrection of the flesh." But our enquirer is of opinion, that "these last words are only an additional explication of what went before, and that they ought therefore to be struck out." He was aware, however, that this proposal might be thought too arbitrary, and might appear too much like taking the point in question for granted. Instead therefore of resting the matter upon this emendation; he objects, that "the creed before us could not be a creed of the African church; because
" it

we may be sure, that the articles, here recited by Tertullian, were in the public creeds before his time, though not perhaps in the very words, which he makes use of. But from his reciting in his dispute with Praxeas only such articles, as related to this dispute, we cannot conclude, that those public creeds contained no others.

† Critical history of the apostles creed, p. 5, 6. Bingham's antiquities, &c. B. x. c. iii. §. i.

¶ "Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis, et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertio die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cœlis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem." Tertull. p. 173.

• Enquiry, &c. p. 16.

“ it makes no mention of the Holy Ghost.” But when Tertullian says positively, that the articles, which he recites, were contained in *the invariable rule of faith*, that is, in the creed; can any one think, that his not reciting all the articles, which were usually contained in the public creeds, is an evidence, that he does not say true, and that those, which he does recite, were not contained in them?

When the other form, which we find in his treatise *de præscriptionibus hæreticorum*, is rightly translated; it says, that “ Christ will come to take the holy to the enjoyment of life eternal, and to sentence the wicked to everlasting fire, both parties,” that is, both the holy and the wicked, “ being raised up by a restoration of the flesh.” The manner, in which

“ Quæramus ergo — id duntaxat, quod salva regula fidei potest in quæstionem devenire. Regula est autem fidei, ut jam huic, quid defendamus, profiteamur, illa scilicet, qua creditur; Unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit per verbum suum primo omnium demissum: Id verbum Filium ejus appellatum, in nomine Dei varie visum a patriarchis, in prophetis semper auditum, postremo delatum ex Spiritu Dei et virtute in virginem Mariam, carnem factum in utero ejus, et ex ea natum egisse Jesum Christum, exinde prædicasse novam legem, et novam promissionem regni cælorum; virtutes fecisse; fixum cruci; tertia die resurrexisse; in cælos ereptum sedisse ad dextram Patris; misisse vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti, qui credentes agat; venturum cum claritate ad sumendos sanctos in vitæ æternæ et promissorum cælestium fructum, et ad
“ pro-

which Tertullian introduces this form, is worth our notice. "Let us, says he, confine our enquiries to such things, as may come into question without violating the rule of faith: and the rule of faith is this, which follows." — ' Though we should here allow what the enquirer supposes, that this was not a public creed; yet it must at least have been a summary of the gospel drawn up by Tertullian in the form of a creed agreeably to his own private opinion. He must therefore have forgotten this creed of Tertullian, when he affirms, that "we meet with no creeds drawn up by any one, upon any occasion, wherein a resurrection *of the flesh* is made a distinct article, before that of Arius and Euzoius:" But how does he make good, what he supposes, that this was not a public creed?

Why
 "profanos adjudicandos igni perpetuo, *facta utriusque partis resurrectione cum carnis restitutione.* Hæc regula, ut probabitur, a Christo instituta nullas habet apud nos quæstiones nisi quas hæreses inferunt, et quæ hæreticos faciunt." Tertull. de præscript. hæreticorum, p. 206, 207.

The words here printed in a different character from the rest are thus translated by Dr. Sykes.—*Both parts of us being raised up with the restoration of the flesh.* But the reader, by comparing them with what goes before, will see, that Tertullian does not speak of raising both the parts of a man, his soul and his body, but that *resurrectio utriusque partis* means *a resurrection of both parties*, of the good and of the bad. This translation agrees with Bingham; — *having first raised both the one and the other, &c.* See his antiquities, &c. B. x. c. iv. §. iii.

' Enquiry, &c. p. 16, 43.

Why, truly ; " " Tertullian says, that it was
 " instituted by Christ ; whereas Christ never
 " instituted such a creed, nor ever taught any
 " thing about a restoration of the flesh." If
 by *such a creed* is here meant this particular
 form of words ; we may prove in the same
 manner, that what we call the apostles creed
 is only a summary of the gospel drawn up by
 our Comber agreeably to his own opinions,
 and that it neither is, nor ever was, a public
 creed of any church. For Comber says, that
 * this creed was composed by the apostles :
 whereas the apostles did not compose this par-
 ticular form of words. But if by *such creed*
 we are to understand the doctrine, which is
 contained in Tertullians form ; then to af-
 firm, that Christ, or the apostles in his name,
 could not be the authors of it, because they
 never taught a restoration of the flesh ; is only
 to take one of the principal points in question
 for granted in order to establish the other :
 it is to take for granted, that the resurrection,
 which the scriptures hold forth to our belief,
 is not such an one, as can be called a resur-
 rection *of the body* ; in order to prove, that
 the public creeds in Tertullians time did not
 use this language in speaking of it. But in
 whichever sense our author used the words
such creed, Tertullian is a very competent wit-
 ness to prove what was the public rule of faith
 in his time ; notwithstanding any mistake,
 which

* Enquiry, &c. p. 18.

* Combers companion to the Temple. Fol. 1688.
 p. 132.

which he may have made about the person, who drew it up. And indeed this very mistake is an evidence, that the form was an antient one: for if it had been lately received by the church, and especially if it had been of his own drawing up; he would have known the origin of it too well to have imagined, that it was drawn up by Christ.

But may it not still be asked, "Whether the expressions in the two forms, of which we have just been speaking, are not so different in the corresponding articles, that both of them could not be baptismal creeds? And if both were not; will it be possible to say which, or indeed whether either of them, was?" All the difficulty, which these questions throw in our way, will easily be removed; if we lay aside our modern notions of things, when we are examining into the practice of antient times. Our own church has three public creeds, which differ from each other in the manner of expressing the same articles of faith; and if the law had not prescribed the particular form, which is to be used in baptism, we might have used any one of the three at our own discretion. In like manner those, who administered baptism in the African church, might be at liberty to use either of the creeds recorded by Tertullian: for though the doctrine, which was contained in the baptismal creeds, seems in his time to have been very nearly the same every where; yet we have no reason to think, that there was

was then any law of the christian church in general, or of the African church in particular, which required, that this doctrine should be always expressed in the same precise words.

A difficulty of the same sort is raised about two creeds, which are delivered down to us by Irenæus, who had been educated in the eastern church, and was made a bishop in Gaul about the year 167. These two creeds, it is objected

Enquiry, p. 11. It is remarkable; that, when Dr. Sykes speaks of what Tertullian calls the invariable *rule of faith*, in which we find the article of a resurrection *of the flesh*, he argues, that this could not be a baptismal creed; because it makes no mention of the Holy Ghost: See above at p. 76. But here he is of opinion, that the shorter of the two creeds quoted from Irenæus, which has not the article of a resurrection *of the flesh*, is more like a baptismal creed, than the longer; notwithstanding the longer mentions the Holy Ghost, and the shorter does not.

The shorter creed is; — “in unum Deum credentes, fabricatorem cœli et terræ, et omnium, quæ in ijs sunt, per Christum Jesum Dei Filium. Qui, propter eminentissimam erga figmentum suum dilectionem, eam, quæ esset ex virgine, generationem sustinuit, ipse per se hominem adunans Deo, et passus sub Pontio Pilato, et resurgens, et in claritate receptus, in gloria venturus, salvator eorum, qui salvantur, et judex eorum, qui judicantur, et mittens in ignem æternum transgressores veritatis et contemptores legis suæ.” Iren. Oxon. 1702. L. iii. c. 4. p. 206.

Irenæus, in the first chapter of the first book, having said; ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατέχων, ὃν διὰ τῆ βαπτίσματος εἰληφε, κ. τ. λ. “Whoever keeps
“ in

jected, could not both be baptismal creeds : because they differ from one another in expression. Our enquirer thinks, that “ the shorter of the two looks most like a baptismal creed.” Irenæus however informs us, that the longer was “ a rule of truth, received by every person at baptism ;” which is a direct testimony, that this was a baptismal creed, whatever the other might be : and one article in this rule of truth is, that “ Christ shall

“ in mind the invariable rule of truth, which he received in baptism, &c.” subjoins this rule of truth in the second chapter. — “ The church, though it be dispersed over all the world from one end of the earth to the other, received from the apostles and their disciples the belief in one God, the Father almighty, maker of the heaven, and the earth, and the seas, and all things in them. And in one Christ Jesus the Son of God, who became flesh for our salvation. And in the Holy Ghost, who preached by the prophets the dispensations, and the advent, and the nativity from a virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the bodily ascent of his beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord into heaven, and his coming again from heaven in the glory of the Father to gather all things together, [*ὅτι πάντα ἡμᾶς πάντων σάρκα καὶ ὡς αὐτὸν ἀνδρώοντο*] and to raise up all flesh of all men, that, according to the will of the invisible father, every knee should bow, of things in earth, and things under the earth, to Jesus Christ our Lord and God and saviour and king ; and that he may exercise just judgment upon all, and send spiritual wickednesses and the transgressing and apostate angels, with all ungodly, unrighteous, lawless, and blaspheming men into everlasting fire, but grant life

L

“ to

“ shall come in the glory of the Father to gather together all things and to raise up all *flesh* of all men.”

^a In our present copies both of the creed delivered by Eusebius to the council of Nice, and likewise of the creed established by this council, there is no mention made of a resurrection of the body or of the flesh. But this omission cannot prove, that there was not, before the time of this council, any such article in any baptismal creed, in opposition to the evidence already produced from the

“ to all righteous and holy men, who keep his commandments, and persevere in his love, some from the beginning, others after repentance, on whom he confers immortality and invests them with eternal glory.” Iren. L. i. c. 1, 2. p. 44, 45.

^a The creed delivered by Eusebius to this council was ; — “ We believe in one God the father almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ the word of God, God of God, light of light, life of life, the only begotten son, the first born of every creature, begotten of God the father before all ages, by whom all things were made. Who for our salvation became incarnate, and con-versed among men; who suffered and rose again the third day; he ascended to the father, and will come again to judge both the quick and dead. We believe also in the Holy Ghost. And each of these to be and exist, the Father to be truly a Father, the Son to be truly a Son, and the Holy Ghost truly a Holy Ghost: as our Lord, when he sent his disciples to preach, said, *Go teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost.*” Socrat. L. i. c. 8.

The

the creeds of Judæa, Italy, Africa, and Gaul. The truth is, that the other articles, which usually follow that relating to the Holy Ghost, such as *the forgiveness of sins, and the life everlasting*, are likewise omitted in both those creeds, as well as the article of the resurrection of the body. And what was said ^b just now of those, who met in the council of Sardica, may be said likewise of those, who met in the council of Nice: they were principally employed in deliberating about the person and quality of the Son of God ;

The creed of the council at Nice was — “ We believe in one God almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible : And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the father, the only begotten, that is, of the substance of the father, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the father, by whom all things both in heaven and earth were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate and made man, and suffered, and the third day rose again, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead, And in the Holy Ghost.” Then follow the anathemas—— “ And those, who say, There was a time, when the son of God was not ; or that he did not exist before he was made, because he was made out of nothing, or of another substance or essence ; or that he was created or mutable ; the catholic and apostolic church anathematizes them.” Socrat. L. i. c. 8.

^b See above at p. 69. and Bingham's antiq. &c. B. x. c. iv. §. xiv.

God ; and therefore in reciting the creed they went no farther, than they were led by the point in debate : but after mentioning the Holy Ghost, they left the rest to be supplied from such creeds, as were then generally received in the christian church. That this was the true reason, why they stopped here, without making a particular recital of the articles, which follow this ; may be collected from the manner, in which the bishops, who met at Antioch about 16 years afterwards, introduce these articles. The first articles of this creed relate to the Father and the Son ; and in the close of it, after saying, “ We believe in the “ Holy Ghost ; ” they go on thus ; “ *εἰ δὲ δεῖ* “ *προσθεῖναι*, and if it is necessary to add this ; “ we believe likewise concerning the resurrection of the flesh and everlasting life.” This introduction, which in our enquirers opinion “ puts

“ — πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· εἰ δὲ δεῖ προσθεῖναι, πιστεύομεν, καὶ περὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως, καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου. Socrat. L. ii. c. x. Enquiry, &c. p. 31.

In the *apostolical constitutions* there is a creed to be repeated by those, who came to be baptized, in which “ with all believers in the holy church they profess a “ faith [*εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν*] in the resurrection of “ *the flesh*, and in the remission of sins, and in the “ kingdom of heaven, and in the life of the world to “ come.” *Constit. apostol. L. viii. c. xli.* Dr. Sykes supposes “ this creed to have been probably drawn “ up about, or rather before, the middle of the fourth “ century.” If he could prove, that it was drawn up about the middle of the fourth century, this might be a reason, why “ he should take no notice of “ it

" puts it beyond all dispute, that this clause " was not in the more antient baptismal " creeds," may serve to convince us of the contrary; if we compare it with the evidence, which we have been examining. The Antiochian bishops do not speak about these articles with doubt and hesitation: when they say, *εἰ δὲ δεῖ πρὸς θεῖναι*, their words are not to be rendered, *if it is proper*, or *if it is lawful*, but *if it is necessary*, we add as follows. They first set forth as much of their faith, as related to the point in dispute: and then, by introducing the remaining articles in this manner, they intimate, that these were articles, about which it might be thought unnecessary to say any thing, as all parties were agreed about them.

Our author allows, that the ^d christian writers, who lived before Irenæus and after
Ig-

" it" in the present question. But when he corrects himself, and says, that it was rather drawn up before the middle of the fourth century; the reader will be likely to ask; how long before? Our author in answer to this question observes, that " it contains just the " same articles with the creed of Arius and Euzoius;" which is quoted above at p. 67. note *; and from hence he concludes, " that it was formed upon the " plan of theirs, and must therefore be of a later date " than the year 327." But we might with as much reason conclude upon the same principle, that what he calls their creed was formed upon the plan of this; and consequently that this was in being before theirs. Enquiry, &c. p. 47, 48.

^d Enquiry, &c. p. 10.

Ignatius, that is, between the end of the first and the middle of the second century, frequently speak of a resurrection *of the body or flesh*: but he adds, that there does not appear to have been either then or earlier any creed which established such a doctrine. He ^e has not however produced on the other hand any creed of so early a date, in which this article is omitted: and from hence we may conclude, that he could not find one. But where nothing

^e What Justin Martyr, says, — that “Christ at his second coming [τὰ σώματα ἀναγερεῖ] will raise the bodies of all men who have ever been, p. 87. — he considers as matter only of private opinion; and represents Justin as a witness, that this article was not in any baptismal creed; because he tells us of no other article, but that all were baptized, [ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁλῶν καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ σωτῆρος, ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου], in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit.” Enquiry, p. 9. With just the same reason I might produce our church catechism; which says, that “persons are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;” to prove, that no other articles but these are contained in our baptismal creed.

^f — ὅς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ νεκρῶν, ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸ ὁμοίωμα, ὡς καὶ ἡμᾶς τὰς πιστεύουσας αὐτῷ ἕτως ἐγερεῖ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Epist. ad Trallianos, c. ix. p. 34. edit. Oxon. 1709.

Dr. Sykes after quoting from Justin Martyr what I have just now mentioned in note ^e, and another short passage, which has no relation to the present question, from his second apology, says, “it was soon after this, that Polycarp suffered.” Enquiry, &c. p. 9, 10. Irenæus writes thus of Polycarp; “He was

thing appears to the contrary; such a general agreement may be looked upon as an evidence, that what he calls the private opinion of christian writers was in reality the public opinion of the church. And we may carry this evidence a little farther back, than he has thought proper to carry it; for he has quoted Ignatius imperfectly, when he makes him say only, that *God will raise up us*: Ignatius's words are; *Christ was truly raised from the dead, in like fashion, as his Father will raise up us, who believe in him.*

We

“ a man, who had not only been taught by the apostles
 “ and conversed with many, who had seen Christ, but
 “ was likewise appointed by the apostles bishop of the
 “ church of Smyrna in Asia; whom I saw in the
 “ early part of my life; for he lived long, and died
 “ in his extreme old age by nobly and gloriously suf-
 “ fering martyrdom.” Iren. L. iii. c. iii. §. 4. A prayer
 used by Polycarp at his martyrdom is recorded in an
 epistle of the church of Smyrna, which is printed with
 his and Ignatius's epistles; c. xiv. p. 71; and in this
 prayer he mentions ἀνάστασις ζωῆς αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ
 σώματος, which Dr. Sykes translates, “ the resurrec-
 “ tion of eternal life, soul and body:” the true trans-
 lation is, *a resurrection of eternal life both of the soul and*
body, that is, a resurrection to eternal life, which life
 is to be enjoyed both by the soul and the body.
 But there could be no eternal life of the body, if
 there was no resurrection of the body. Whenever there-
 fore Polycarp suffered martyrdom; this opinion about
 the resurrection must have been as early as the times of
 the apostles: unless any one can suppose, that this ve-
 nerable father took up a precarious opinion very late in
 his life, and proclaimed it with his last breath, when he
 was just going to suffer martyrdom. He has indeed “ in
 “ his epistle to the Philippians mentioned a resurrection
 “ twice;

We shall see how much this testimony of Ignatius is to our purpose if, we go on to enquire; whether the scriptures do not justify the language of such creeds, as speak of the resurrection of *the body*.

St. John teaches us, that, notwithstanding we cannot form any notion about the change, which shall happen to us at the coming of Christ; yet of this we may be assured, that, "when he shall appear; we shall be like him." And to those, who ask; ^h "How are the dead "raised up and with what body do they "come?" St. Paul does not reply, that the resurrection, which is promised in the gospel, cannot be called a resurrection of the body, so that this question was nothing to the purpose; but, after reprimanding them for not having observed, how many different sorts of bodies there are in nature, or not having made use

"twice; in one place he says; [*ὁ δὲ ἑγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἑγείσει*] *He, who raised up Christ from the dead, will raise up us:* and in the other; [*ὁ ὁμοιωσάμενος ἡμῖν ἑγείρας ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν*] *He hath promised us to raise us from the dead.*" But these expressions are no evidence, that, when he wrote this epistle, he did not believe such a resurrection, as may probably be called a resurrection of the body.

Clemens Romanus, who lived in the times of the apostles, "mentions the resurrection of *the flesh*; in his second epistle, c. xxi: but this, says Dr. Sykes, "is allowed to be not genuine." Perhaps he should have rather said, that many learned men have doubted, whether it is genuine or not. In his first epistle, which is authentic, "the doctor found nothing more men-
"tioned

use of this observation to remove their doubts about the resurrection, he informs them, that as we have born the image of the first man, who was earthly, so shall we likewise bear the image of the Lord from heaven. Was then the body of Christ raised? The women, who went to his sepulchre, were informed by two angels, that the reason, why they did not find his body there, was, because he was risen from the dead: we have therefore the testimony of angels to prove, that the resurrection of Christ was a resurrection of the body. We have likewise the testimony of St. Peter to the same purpose, who argues, that ^k the flesh of Christ did not see corruption; because he was raised from the dead. Nay we have the testimony of Christ himself to prove it: ^l "handle me, says he, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me ^m have."

"tioned; than *the resurrection*, c. xxiv; and not any particular modus of it, or the resurrection of the "flesh." Enquiry, &c. p. 9. But if he had searched the whole epistle he would have found, that Clemens, in c. xxvi. where he makes use of Job xix. 25, 26. as a collateral proof of a resurrection, writes, thus; *παλι-
ν ἰαε λέγει, καὶ ἀναστήσει τὴν σαρκὰ μὲ ταύτην, τὴν ἀνα-
τλήσασαν πάντα πάλιν.* "Again, Job says, And thou shalt raise up this flesh of mine, which has gone through all these calamities." Whether he interprets the words of Job rightly or not, is foreign from the present question: his interpretation of them and his manner of applying them plainly shew what language might in his opinion be made use of in speaking of the resurrection.

^s 1 Joh. iii. 2. ⁱ 1 Cor. xv. 35-49. ^l Luk. xxiv. 3-6.

^k Act. ii. 29, 30, 31. ^m Luk. xxiv. 39.

“ have.” If then we shall be raised as Christ was ; we retain the language of the scriptures, when we declare our belief of a resurrection of the body : for we use the same words in speaking of our resurrection, which the scriptures have used in speaking of his.

^m St. Matthew, when he relates the prodigies, which attended the death and the resurrection of our Lord, says, that “ many bodies “ of saints, which slept, arose, and went into “ the holy city after his resurrection and appeared unto many.” Is then the language of our creed, when it speaks of those, who shall be raised by Christ hereafter, different from the language of the evangelist, when he speaks of those, who have been raised by him already ?

St. Paul, when he is arguing against fornication, urges, that ⁿ “ the body is not for for- “ nication but for the Lord : — and God hath “ both raised up the Lord and will also raise “ up us by his own Spirit.” But if we interpret the word *us* in this place so, as to make it mean any thing, but *our body*; we shall render the apostles argument inconclusive : for however a judgment to come might be a reason for keeping *our minds and consciences* void of offence; yet, unless the body is to be raised, the special consideration of a resurrection would be no reason for keeping *our bodies* undefiled.

He says indeed elsewhere, ^o that “ flesh “ and blood cannot inherit the kingdom “ of God.” But lest his readers should sup-
pose

^m Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. ⁿ 1 Cor. vi. 13, 14, 15.

^o 1 Cor. xv. 50, 53. 42—49.

pose him to mean any thing more than flesh and blood in its present condition, and should make him inconsistent with himself by extending his words to our bodies, when they are transformed into the likeness of Christs glorious body, he immediately informs them, that this corruptible thing, which we call flesh or body, shall at the last day be so changed, as to put on incorruption. And having distinguished between a natural body, or a body, which has only an animal life, and a spiritual body, or a body, which has a spiritual life, he declares, that our bodies in their present condition are of the former sort; and as to their condition after the resurrection, when they shall be of the latter sort, he uses, if not the very words of our creed, yet such words as plainly shew, that a resurrection of the body is no improper expression; for he says, that “ a natural body is sown, *a spiritual body is raised.*”

He tells the Romans, that ^p the whole race of mankind groaned through desire of being “ delivered from the bondage of corruption “ into the glorious liberty of the sons of God; “ and that even they, who had the first fruits “ of the Spirit, groaned within themselves, “ waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their body.” According to our authors interpretation, the redemption of our bodies, here spoken of, means ^q “ our deliverance from the bodies, which we now “ have.”

^p Rom. viii. 19—23. ^q Enquiry, &c. p. 7.

“ have.” But the apostle says, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν, and not τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν and whoever reads this passage with-

If St. Pauls words had been τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν, they would necessarily have signified *deliverance from our body*. Nor will I affirm, that τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν is such an expression, as could not possibly admit of this sense, if it was detached from the context: for, Heb. ix. 15, we meet with a similar expression ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν παραβάσεων, which in the opinion of Grotius means the same as ἀπολύτρωσιν ἀπὸ τῶν παραβάσεων. But if the words τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν may signify redemption, or deliverance, from our body, they may likewise signify the redemption or deliverance of our body; just as, Ephes. i. 4, ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως means redemption of the possession; and, Luk. xvi. 28, ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν means the redemption of you.

Dr. Sykes says, that “ as τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν, Rom. viii. 23, relates to that state of happiness, which we are now *hoping* for, and which we “ are hereafter to enjoy, it is not a resurrection of our “ bodies, but a freedom or deliverance from the “ “dies, that we bear about us, that the apostle has in “ view.” Enquiry, &c. p. 7. And may not we say on the other hand, that as τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν relates to that state of happiness, which we are now hoping for, and which we are hereafter to enjoy, it is a deliverance of our bodies from the bondage of corruption? The principle, from which he argues will lead us to one of these conclusions as well as to the other; that is, if the words may be taken in either of these two senses, this principle will not help us to determine which of the two is the true sense.

But from the context we learn, that what all mankind are here said to groan after is a *deliverance from the bondage* of

without having any particular opinion to support, will probably see, that this redemption of our bodies consists, not in delivering

of corruption, from the vanity, to which they have been subjected; and that the τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος, which they, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, wait for and groan after, means the same thing: the only difference between these and the rest of mankind is, that these wait in such hope of this deliverance, as the others have not. Now the bondage of corruption, the vanity, to which all mankind have been subjected, does not consist in their having bodies; for this was not the consequence of Adams transgression: it consists in the frailty and mortality, which his transgression introduced into their bodies. Therefore the ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν, which the apostle here speaks of, means the deliverance of our body from its frailty and mortality.

By consulting 2 Cor. v. 2. 3. 4. we may be farther informed, what it was, which they groaned for, to whom, as we read at verse 5th, “God had given the earnest of the Spirit.”—“The sense of this passage,” says Tillotson, will be very clear and current, if we make a small alteration in the version, where our translators have not attained the true sense. *In this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven; [ἵνα γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐνδυσάμενοι, ὡς γυμνοὶ, ἐκτεθώμεθα,] if so be we shall be found clothed and not naked. We are desirous to be clothed upon with our house from heaven (that is, with our immortal and spiritual bodies) if so be it shall so happen, that at the coming of Christ, we shall be found in these bodies and not stripped of them before by death. And then it follows; for we, that are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened (that is, with*

livering us from them, but in delivering them from the bondage of corruption. In his epistle to the Philippians he teaches us at what time and by what power this deliverance will be wrought. * “ We look, says he, for a
 “ saviour from heaven the Lord Jesus Christ,
 “ who [μετασχηματίσει] shall change, [that is,
 “ shall transform] our vile body, that it may
 “ be fashioned like unto his glorious body,
 “ according to the mighty working, whereby
 “ he is able even to subdue all things unto
 “ himself.” But I know not how we can find more proper words to declare our belief of a resurrection, in which our body shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, and in which our vile body shall be so transformed, as to be made like the glorious body of Christ,
 than

“ with the afflictions and pressures of this life;) *not*
 “ *for that we would be unclothed*, (that is, not that we
 “ desire by death to be devided of these bodies,) *but*
 “ *clothed upon*, (that is, if God see it good, we had
 “ rather be found alive, and changed, and without
 “ putting off these bodies have immortality, as it
 “ were, superinduced) *that so mortality might be swallowed up of life.*” [See Tillotsons sermon preached at the funeral of Dr. Whichcot.] Thus we find, that what they, who had the earnest of the Spirit, or the first fruits of the Spirit, groaned after, was a deliverance of their body from mortality, and not a deliverance of themselves from their body: for if God thought fit, they rather desired to continue in it, till by being transformed into the likeness of Christs glorious body it should become immortal.

* Philip. iii. 20, 21.

than those of our common creed; *I believe in the resurrection of the body.*

If any one maintains, that there may be a resurrection of the dead, without a resurrection of the body; we have no occasion to enter into this debate with him. The proper answer is, that, unless the resurrection of the dead, which he believes, is such an one, as may be called a resurrection of the body; his faith must be different from that, which was expressed in the public creeds of the primitive church, and is taught in the gospel.

THE END.

Printed for Messrs. T. and W. Woodcock, in Cambridge, and sold by J. Richardson, A. Millar, and C. D'Almeida, in London.

A letter to the Reverend Dr. Kennicott, in which his defence of the Samaritan pentateuch is examined, and his *second* dissertation on the state of the printed Hebrew text of the old testament is shewn to be in many instances injudicious and inaccurate.

9 DE 63

A second letter to the Reverend Dr. Kennicott, in which his defence of his second dissertation is examined.

Printed for Messrs. Thurlbourn and Woodyer in Cambridge,
and sold by J. Richardson, A. Millar, and C. Bathurst, in
London.